

first name	last name	user_state	letter
Alice	Adams	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Patricia	Romero	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ashlie	Harrison	<p>MN</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Pratt	<p>NV</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Gill	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Arroyo	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Riley	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Gillaspie	TN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Fletcher	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
S		KS	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species, and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and that loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated for national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Harrington	DC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Madden	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Reichert	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Brandt	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bernstein	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Reynolds	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Burch	<p>FL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	McClain	<p>OH</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bumgarner	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Novel	WY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Smith	DE	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Warner	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Terney	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Balk	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Heaslip	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Dombeck	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Turner	SD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lotito-Schuh	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Whipps	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Boydston	NV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Dolowitz	UT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Avni	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Yousef	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Ruscitti	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Lewis	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Ricketts	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Richter	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Candelmo	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Thomas	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Edwards	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Gershon	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Devoss	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Flanagan	<p>GA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Williams	<p>CA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Flint	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Philipps	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kerner	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Findley	NV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	DeBoer	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Pruitt	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Bell	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents DO NOT provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts, on people & wildlife, cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity your citizens need to live.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia. A complete failure to respect state and federal laws protecting every citizen's water sources.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives, market shifts and opportunities towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you. TGBell of Wisconsin</p>
Alexander	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Truong	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Sullivan	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lewis	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Groom	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lydia	Pudzianowski	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Thompson	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Decembly	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Woodruff	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Guss	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Levinson	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Gorrin	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>I respectfully request that the U.S. Forest Service select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. Accordingly, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, I ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comment.</p>
Brown	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Peischl	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Charrier	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Cho	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Rostholder	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Laurel	Tumarkin	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Watson	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	stanton	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Birdsill	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Stilwell	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Barrett	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Howe	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Dot	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	McKinley	<p>GA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Ghenoiu	<p>NY</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

STREET	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable; the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an important role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you, John W. Street</p>
Morris	VT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Chay	RI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Armstrong	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rinear	<p>NJ</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	gold	<p>PA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Souza	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hagins	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	theermann	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Sirlin	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Renshaw	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Knapp	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rogelio	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Cook	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Madeleine	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Russo	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Dutka	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Pinn	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Welkowitz	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Pat	Tonnema	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Tuddenham	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hoehne	AL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Gaur	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Divasta	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Fails	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lynch	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Baker	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Louchard	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Higgins	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Smith	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Weichman	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	McClusky	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Dufresne	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Benavides	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Johnston	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Martin	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Drumm	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Zebker	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Malach	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Keim	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Stamm	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Reid	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Misovich	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Welsford	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Deng	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Romero Villanue	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kowaliw	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Chapman	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan. I implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Elder	NV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Doscher	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service select Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Dhondup	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Me	Roberts	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Pierce	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Doyle	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan. The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated.</p> <p>These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest. Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We strongly urge the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	kelson	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Egan	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Lundquist	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Wilson	ME	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Scott	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Berger	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Auerbach	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Conard	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bourlotos	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Knowlton	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rountree	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Lepola	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Ackley	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Nelson	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Glasscock	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Glasscock	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Safford	MT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Krueger	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Strasinger	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Patterson	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Acosta	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Tamarack	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Boone	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Wittmann	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Quinn	DC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Mullen	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Tornatore	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Coyle	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Yeomans	KS	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Mortier	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Drinkwater	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Drinkwater	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Peters	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Peters	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Edith	Neimark	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Edith	Neimark	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Stone	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Garbrick	KS	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Williams	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Jackson	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Thombs	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Klimo	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sachs	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Elaine	Tucker	ME	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	du Pont-Passigli NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Van Alstyne CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Baker	<p>FL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Shahzada	<p>CA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Lalwani	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Petra	Danon	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Glenn	ID	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lauren	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Petra	Pachoud	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Berumen	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kondreck	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Fisher	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Fordham	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Cardone	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Kathe	Garbrick	<p>KS</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Martinez	<p>CA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Barrett	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Sutor	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Horowitz	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	S.	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Azrin	AL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
tran	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Matthews	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Tatro	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Glielmi	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Creswell	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Carr	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Montgomery	CT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Jerstrom	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hubbard-Reeves	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	O'Brien	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Wilson	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service select Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Watson	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bohne	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lebednik	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>I implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, I again ask that the U.S. Forest Service select Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Blanton	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Tait	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Krueger	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you. Karen Krueger</p>

	Alexander	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Siegler	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Ouellette	ME	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bakalova	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Dettmann MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Johansen WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Forman	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Tiedt	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hetrick	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Rowell	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Evans	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species, and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jewell	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Granfors	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Paine	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Shuda	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	stephens	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Knieriem	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes: Construction should not be done on the mountain The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Paul	Gehrke	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Skwierczynski WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Davison PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Klopfers	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes: I am adding my entreaty to the other voices requesting that the Mountain Valley Pipeline not be permitted through the Jefferson National Forest. I am particularly concerned that the U.S. Forest Service might relax existing standards for a new fossil fuel infrastructure. That would be a decidedly counter productive decision when the need to reduce dependence on fossil fuels is so urgent.</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Kenneth Klopfers Longmeadow, MA 01106</p>
	Sparks	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes: I am adding my entreaty to the other voices requesting that the Mountain Valley Pipeline not be permitted through the Jefferson National Forest. I am particularly concerned that the U.S. Forest Service might relax existing standards for a new fossil fuel infrastructure. That would be a decidedly counter productive decision when the need to reduce dependence on fossil fuels is so urgent.</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Roney	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Nichols	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	meyer	DC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Adamo	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Klemic	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Moen	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Thomasson	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Smiley	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Galvin	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Stavis	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Maddalena	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Compton	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Wingfield	<p>AZ</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Wright	<p>AZ</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Campbell	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Szyszowski	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Abbasparker	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Whitbeck	LA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Followill	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Fernande	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Westoby	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Edds	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Clark	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Brian	Fink	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Fitch	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Joyce	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Stoll	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Ringel	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Johnson	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Haffey	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Crawford	VT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Qazi-Lampert	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Oliver	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Becker	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Solis	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
saign	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lewis	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Ciocci	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Tonini	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
BALABANIAN	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bowman	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Alm	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Ballengee	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Barbara	Armitage	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Gilcrist	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, as are all of us, and the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity. Our own well being as Americans is connected to the health of our environment.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Hero	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Storey	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Johnston	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Norback	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes,</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to eleven crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break eleven of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These eleven proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed eleven changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the eleven proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Gary	Hess	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sammis	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kaczmarek	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Javurek	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Sargent	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Cosden	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Wharton	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lage	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Hoffman	DC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Turbush	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Crutcher	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	FERRERO	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hoffman	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Streib	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Vota	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

C	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
M	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Dunham	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	zook	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Burger	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Mittelman	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Jergens	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Steinhart	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Leah	Roffman	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bramley	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

hill	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Sudheer	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Caminiti	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Ford	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

New	VT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Iverson	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Garey	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Collins	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Pundt	CT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Cherrington	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Brackney	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Brett	Cherrington	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Morrison	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Karvouna	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Allen Reid	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Elias	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Wilson	NE	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Becker	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The rules and regulations for managing Jefferson National Forest were put in place years ago, based on the best available information and judgment available at the time.</p> <p>The economic development interests of private investors have not changed ANY of the information and judgment that were used to put those rules and regulations in place.</p> <p>There is no compelling NEED for the natural gas this pipeline would deliver, and allowing this pipeline to be built would result in an additional 20-30-40 or maybe MORE years of burning a fossil fuel. Ironically, the best science currently available is telling us that, if we want to survive as a species ♦♦♦ if we want our children and grandchildren to have a life sustaining environment , we must be moving AWAY from fossil fuels as quickly as possible.</p> <p>Changing the rules to accommodate the selfish financial ambitions of a small number of powerful individuals would be nothing less than a gross sell-out of the public interests.</p> <p>Do the right thing: DENY MVP♦♦♦s request for rule amendments!</p> <p>Thank you for being brave enough to stand up for the forests, and for the future of our planet!</p> <p>Mark G Becker 143 Caldwell Lane Newport, VA 24128</p>

Lange	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. I say: "How dare they!!" This is clearly greed above all else. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest. These natural areas are fundamental to the health of ecosystems and groundwater which are essential but vulnerable. Negative environmental impacts from projects such as this cannot continue to be diminished! Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>I implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia. I find it outrageous that they ask for even more concessions.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, I again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Hewitt	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Goulait	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Parra	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Wix	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Garcia	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Tashjian	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Entered as a Forms Plus 2/17/2023, Broughman, VA	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>Please, please, do not let that pipeline be finished! My homeplace of Bent Mountain, Virginia has already been scarred & habitat for many animals has already been taken. I have friends who were forced to sell their land to accommodate this horrible project, by Eminent Domaine, which was quasi legal as none of that community will benefit from that construction-a conduit for gas obtained by fracking-so, yet another brutally invasive process inflicted upon another ecosystem. Everything about this MVP deal stinks; it's a corrupt, rotten deal shoved down our throats by greedy executives & politicians. All of whom, I'm sure, would never agree to let it be built in their backyard. I'm sorry for the angry tone, but you see I AM angry, this whole thing truly makes me sick; when I really think about it, it makes me weep with grief. So I cannot be as articulate & knowledgeable as the letter which follows, written by a scientist, I'm sure. I agree with it totally, but wanted to be sure to include my own thoughts since this isn't a project far away, off in the woods somewhere to me- it's an abomination happening all over the home I loved as a youngster & still love, where many friends & a few family members still live. Please know, none of us in that community want that cursed project to continue. Please, listen to us & stop it! It's already scarred Bent Mountain, but you can make sure it goes no further & doesn't scar Jefferson National Forest as well. Please, I beg you to listen! ?</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Stentz	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kandel	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Follett	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Leeder	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Mark	Stone	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Spurgas	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lipsitt	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
n	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Averbeck	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Catherine	Allport	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hatzenbeller	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia. It only makes sense to STOP this project in its tracks before it does more damage.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Marian	Kirkpatrick	UT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hersch	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Reese	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Penning	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	McVicker	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Touchton	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Taylor	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rasmussen	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	WILCOX	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Eubanks	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Clark	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Delvillan	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Merrill	Fox	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sinica	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Roman	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Colarulli	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Sheets	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Asseff	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Thomas	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hoard	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Waymouth	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Skip	Hansen	<p>NV</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be reasonably permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Boyd	<p>CO</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Roberts	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Daneil	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Caleb	Pollack	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	wilczynski	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Barton	NV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jason	RI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Valley	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jones	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sirotiak	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable; the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Soyk	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Ceazan	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Taylor	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Andersen	ID	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Brison	CT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Koch	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Strand	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Wolfe	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Boldman	ID	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sjostrom	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Melroy	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Harvison	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Keller	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Burke	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
De La O	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sillasen	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Diab	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Gary and Claudia Battin	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Charlotte L	Gormley CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Padgett	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Smith	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Spitler	NV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Taylor	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	CARROLL	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Marina	Atlas	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bauer	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Fleming	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Drescher	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	McLaughlin	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Driver	DC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Ng	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Irish	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Sheidlower	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Cuba	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lewin	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service rules represent purpose and commitment. The Forest Service must not allow itself or anyone else to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC or anyone else. The environmental risks associated with these 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable; negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be allowed. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, their loss cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant's allegation of desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, is speculative and unproven. Existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives show need to reduce and eventually eliminate this pipeline.</p> <p>We again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Bryan	McCay	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Keenan	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Fairrow	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Spraker	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Paraham	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Grisham	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Meyer	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Quintero	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Krause	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Duncan	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Vong	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Robison	RI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Holubowski	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Plummer	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Shafran	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kearns	DC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Marguerite	Cawley	<p>VT</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	BARKER	<p>DC</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Ropelewski	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bortoluzzo	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Muletz	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Cook	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Easter	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
SELLAM	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	segal	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Slaback	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Garcia	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Coronado-Flores	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kottner	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Umland	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	McCoy	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Martinez	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Gorlin	DC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Acuff	WV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Woodward	ME	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>I know this is a 'canned' letter but I don't think I can state it any better! Please, please give serious consideration to its contents re. The Mountain Valley Pipeline project. Tnx! Jean</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Shumway	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Little	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Parmelee	CT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Fritz	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Gosche	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Ashley	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Nathan	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Hill	CT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
NANGLE	ME	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kennedy	AL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Swaffield	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Morgan	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Johnson	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Eittinger	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Chambers	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

lewis	ID	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Knox	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Cloner	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Balsley	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Taylor	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Gerlach	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Elchlepp	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	McMullin	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Schneider	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kuffner	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Foutty	ID	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Smith	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Wright	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Hamoy	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Blake	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Swan	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Pierce	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lynch	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Parnall	<p>MI</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Mcdaniel	<p>IA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Rubin	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Seff	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Beuthien	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Sadur	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Heins	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Treasor	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Schneider	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Homrich	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Homrich	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Morgan	WV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Lamberta	<p>FL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Smith	<p>WV</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rogers	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Swank	WV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Salinas	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Watson	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Giron-Mushfiq	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Clark	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	ATKINS	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Konchar	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Corwin-Roach WV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Gerome PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Bass	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Steigerwalt	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Pruitt	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Ervin	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Cook	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Bower	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Weiner	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Donnelly	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rogers	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Brown	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Heinly	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Snorden Perry	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lenz	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Deaver	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Carlson	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Quick	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Zurkammer	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Cummings	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Dolan	<p>FL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Brown	<p>MA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Bush	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Rettschlag	ID	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Kapp	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Carter	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kocica	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Altmeyer Alvey	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Beshears	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Brown	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Riggio	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Lyon	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Wills	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Albow	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Manolis	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kenny	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jordan	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
E Green	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Del Sesto	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Harksen	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Dunn	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Millner	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Smith	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Wagner	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Trowbridge	MT	<p>comment: Hello, Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bowman	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Vevia	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Sprague	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Richardson	WV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Walz	MS	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Tougas	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Henry	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rosenstein MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Roche OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Ferguson	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Stambaugh	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Evavold	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Trepanier	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Szymanski	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	decock	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Kain	SC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Illiano	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sessoms	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	White	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lillie	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Please take a stand for our planet and her creatures, if we don't nothing else will matter! Thank you Thank you.</p>
Rivers	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Hill	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
OMalley	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Teed	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
La Riva	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Jiranek	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Helmbacher	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Frانيا	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives. Thanks</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Berk	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you. Astrid Berk</p>

	Johnson	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Madison	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Schnorr	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Harrington	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Trachtenberg	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bruns	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Hijaz	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Griffith	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rodes	WV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kuppersmith	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mchugh	MT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Graas	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Cates	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lee	RI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Sloan	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
McCarty Ellis	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hansen	WV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Lutes	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Nicolai	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
McDaniel	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Nosser	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kay	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rollins	<p>FL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Nixon	<p>TX</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Pino	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kenny	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>You are INVITING ACTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL TERRORISM TO HAPPEN & YOU WILL BE AS GUILTY AS THE GREEDY CORPORATIONS WHEN THAT HAPPENS! PROTECT OUR FORESTS & ALL THE BEINGS THAT CALL IT HOME!</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Matkin	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kravetz	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kucek	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Vargo	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Schenk	<p>FL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Schure	<p>PA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Cristan	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Palmer	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Colgan-Davis PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Sklar MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Curry	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Dalman	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	BAILEY	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Noonanda	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Stamper	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Albert	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Cohn	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hodge	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Matz	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Gulla	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Bown	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>This is important.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Gulseth	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Baldwin	WA	<p>comment: Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service-Cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We demand the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you-What's in your wallet?!</p>
	Zieff	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Paez-johns	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Thomson	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Morton	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Van Fossen	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Guy	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Ellsworth	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ford	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Liss	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Vinson	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kennedy	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sanders	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Peitzmeyer	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Sterling	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Masters	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hassler	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Wessels	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Ackelson	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Willows	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Mierlot	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Morrison	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Laudonio	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hall	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ridlen	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Fox	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	peabody	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Read	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	McWhirter	NE	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Falkenberg	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Wiley	ME	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Apone	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Higgins	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Webster	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Blaser	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Richter	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Stobbs	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Burrell	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hamilton	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Holmes	UT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Williamson	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Whetstone	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bingham	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bittle	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Skirving	<p>TN</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	La Croix	<p>CA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hoerler	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Halpern	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kelchak	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Troyano	LA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Appler	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Johnson	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Madigan	<p>MI</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Miranda	<p>MA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Roberts	KS	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Brickey	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Pasholk	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Clift	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The following statement is provided by the Green New Deal, I would like to ask you, why we need this oil? The only answer I can come up with is to make a few people richer and degrade the future of the human race. The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Doherty	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Dillon	MS	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Joyce	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Edwards	ID	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Waite	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Priest	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sergienko	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Closson	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Scarborough	ME	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bound	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Smith	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Fachet	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Donahue	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Van Maren	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Yensen	UT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would im</p>

Hall	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Pappalardo	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Schell	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Granato	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kellett	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Rydberg	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Schmidt	<p>IL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Duttlinger	<p>IL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Andersen	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Wolfe	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Jacobsen	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Peters	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kramer Perry	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Taylor	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Weed	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
McDaniel-Gilmar	MT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Johnson	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Miller	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	LaRose	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Toshalis	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Scott	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Parry	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Dockins	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Schmitt	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Benedict	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Way	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Stenberg	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Linton	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	koehler	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Rose	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Burns	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Weissman	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Collea	<p>NH</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Duffey	<p>NJ</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Johnson	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Fackler	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

harris	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kessler	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Esposito	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Raspotnik	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mackovjak	AK	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Moran	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Conzemius	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	McDowell	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Laskasky	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Pryke	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mersmann	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Mccracken	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Cameron	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Udovich	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Thompson	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Douglas	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Wible	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
May	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Day	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Guyette	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Shang	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Coursey	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Look	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Murphy	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Cusack	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Olson Six	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Love	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Pizzola	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ryk	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Stadther	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

<p>Roys</p>	<p>MN</p>	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<p>Lemmons</p>	<p>TX</p>	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Hite	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kyrk	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Green	OK	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Howard	TN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Jordan	WV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Meyerkopf	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Fonseca	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Morrill	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Schardt	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kayser	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Blumberg	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Endean	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Shane	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Guevara	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Zehr	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Westcott	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lista	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Rosenberger	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Krieger	NE	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Flores	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hawley	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Wagner	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Gates	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes: PLEASE STOP THE MOUNTSIN VALLEY PIPELINE NOW!</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Landrigan	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Marlowe	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Pellonari	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Conway	<p>GA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Ibarra	<p>CA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Warren	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Cotton	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Juras	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Zornek-Stevens	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Arayaes	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Schwarz	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Chaplic	<p>FL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Boots	<p>IA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Arant	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	escobedo	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Van Sant	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Webb	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Jeffries	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	bruton	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Pollock	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Willis	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	<p>◆◆◆◆ Ambrogio NJ</p>	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	<p>Stevens CO</p>	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Grimes	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Monroe	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Perkal	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Anderson	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Davies	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Lynch	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Castle	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Goetz	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Schneyer	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Walden	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	E APPLGATE TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Patton PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hughes	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Vu	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Rom	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Navarro	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Marsh	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Carmichael	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Johnson	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	E Cupp	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bollinger	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Spence	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Harrison	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Stauffer	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Reid	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Mitchell	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jesse	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
DuValle	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Vaca	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Torrez	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Marsala	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kolbe	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Smith	VT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Miller	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Walters	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Mathisen	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Diaz	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Nisbett	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Rouse	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Holladay	UT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Wilson	NV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Brink	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Bowe	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Irwin	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Robeson	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Ellauri	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jones	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Ramos	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Anderson	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hoskins	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Tassinari	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Jones	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Schultz	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	VandenBroek	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Finck-Rothman NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Peterson CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

smith	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Liebling	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Dodson	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kacek	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Fuller	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
sullo	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	ZEPEDA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Lewis	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Aumann	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Borgia	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Jorgensen	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	FRIEL	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Green	LA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Cavoretto	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Davidson NV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>PLEASE put human health and the health of our planet FIRST -NOT the profits of big oil. It's way past time to shut down fossil fuels. Use your authority as the Forest Service to take a stand! Reject the 11 changes requested by big oil! The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	LaPolla NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Schneider	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Christian	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lange	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
FLAMMIA	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kosuth	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Schlecht	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Arnold	<p>MD</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Green	<p>IL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Cohen	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>I have just become aware of the changes being asked for to continue construction of the Mountain Valley pipeline and I am writing to ask you to withdraw them.</p> <p>The Mountain Valley project's Environmental Impact Statement (#50036) proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Salza	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Brooks	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	French	LA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Roth	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Busbey	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Piccione	<p>FL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Ramsey	<p>CA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mulcahy	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Weissberg	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mazariegos	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Mittelstaedt	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Stoessel	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Ranidae	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ward	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Leifer	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	M Scarpaci	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Poter	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kostidis	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Gan	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	McReynolds	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	carroll	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Durkin	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Ellis	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Coco	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Mish	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are incredibly vital to reducing CO2 but they remain very vulnerable to negative environmental impacts and cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests in particular play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Wolff Landau	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Satin	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Fassbender MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bohlman WY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Spires	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Irizarry	SC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Schacker	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Harrison	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Burrell	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Beardi	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ryan	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Baxter	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Zollo	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Whitaker	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Osmundson	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Terrell	NV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Elfenbein	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Benton	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Oppelt	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Rambel	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Meyer	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Barno	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Guillen	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Byknish	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Martin	<p>CT</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Simpson	<p>IL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Thomas	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Calejo	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Blume	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Van Blair	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Shane	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Senser	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	BURKE	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Gamble	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Lawson	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Lindsay	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Fitzpatrick	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Brumett	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Van Drunen	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Dohner	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Eschbach	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Musser	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Huntsman	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Gilbertson	WV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia. I live in West Virginia and enjoy the natural beauty here, which feeds my soul.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest. Please make the right decision - for the forests, the people, the wildlife and the environment for generations to come. Profit for corporations cannot be put above the greater good.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Whalen	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Santanello	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Brock	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	French	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Fergusson	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Murphy	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Farley	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Morris	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest. On this Valentine's Day, please- love the planet we all share. Without care, it will die ?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Carter	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Thorson	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Reiser	UT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Murray	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Visscher	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Militello	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sharp PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bradley-Bennett CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Gussman	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Wheeler	AL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Roberts	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Jordan	AR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Jenik	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Ferguson	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Young	CT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Caolo	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Platko	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Mathison	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lin	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Gruver	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Zitter	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Knight	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Belgiorno	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bartos	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Davis	AR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Zaouay	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Shammas	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kallick	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	McQueen	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Melas	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bilenchi	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hufnagel	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Spear	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Nafziger	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sherry-Mau	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Woodard	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Koshak	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest. Just Say No!</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Dunbar	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Butsko	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Abel	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Pavlov	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Medina	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Nason	<p>AL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bonta	<p>SC</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

burns	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Oliver	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	<p>ODonnell, Esq</p> <p>KY</p>	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	<p>Kasparian</p> <p>NH</p>	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Weyhing	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Nelson	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hansen	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Miah	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Reisch	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Harper-France	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Waggoner	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Dusette	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Salcius	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Chelosky	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Hatcher	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
O'Connell	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bamford	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Darragh	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Larro	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Strutzenberg	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kepple	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Carton	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

White	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Davis-Cohen	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Shea	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Heilman	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Van Wert	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Gibson	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Hines	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Estrada	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Morales	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Graham	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Allen	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Barricarte	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Heyl	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kiss	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Perry	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Mommaerts-Brov	NE	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would im</p>
Wann	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Draxler	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Tripp	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Griffiths Vega	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Keaton	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Felts	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Fortney	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rubin	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Johns	CT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Addis	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kissam	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Roy	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Sansone	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Von Berg	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Summers	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rosenthal	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>This is outrageous. The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Murray	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Barkley	NV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Brown	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sargent	VT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Caplan	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

DePree	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Brumbaugh-Cayf IL		<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ryan	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Schmidt	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	MacLeod	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	High	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Schicker	<p>FL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	L◆◆◆Ecluse	<p>CA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Yoshida	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Brown	SD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bent	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Winslow	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Ponn Muhler VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Giovanoni IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Lombardo	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Scribner	NV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Reed	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Stevens	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bunch	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bennett	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Valens	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kindrat	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Nicolai	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kittner	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Titus	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Whitlow	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Carlton	<p>TN</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Applefield	<p>OR</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Davidson	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Ginsberg	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kantola	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Nunez	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rukavina	MT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Broadus	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Richardson	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Vaillancourt	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Cocks	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Carpenter	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rogers	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Baker	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Biskupski	UT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bloom	VT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Twaddle	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Stephens	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Huber	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Johnson	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Perruccio	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	DeFelice	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Skalsky	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kremlacek	NE	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hamilton	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Spangler	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Murphy	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Gyurics	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Ambort-Rudolph TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Alexander CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bruin	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Wilson	WV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kaplan	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Manson	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mansmith	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Sand	MT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Forshey	UT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Murphy	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Garcia	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>As a former science teacher who always taught climate change, I know kids are discouraged and scared. They need to know we are thinking about the Earth we will leave them. Do the following for every beautiful kid is your own and everyone's family: The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. You set the tone for kids in schools to just rewrite rules whenever they feel like the rules get in the way of their selfish interest. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia. Why reward this bad behavior by simply changing the rules they find so hard to follow?</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives. For once, reward the good guys, please?</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Joy	ME	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	VanDerWeij	CA	<p>comment: Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are ESSENTIAL for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bachtell	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Butkus	<p>IL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Cramer	<p>OH</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mueller	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hartigan	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	AL SABTI	<p>MI</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	de Voogd	<p>NJ</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Nakamura	HI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Appel	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Breene	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Ramsdell	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Keenan	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hall	CT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

LASKIN	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Erbacher Grey	KS	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jones	TN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
McDermaid	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Moon	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
--	------	----	---

	Beyers	NV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>Thanking GNDN-NY for the shared space to comment:</p> <p>Solar energy development in Nevada - promoted by Usual Suspect Invisibles in the DOE and DOI, and facilitated by the BLM, for commercial corporate utility-variety rush investment - has caused irreparable, and - increasingly - unnecessary damage, to actually valuable, limited, irreplaceable natural resources in the unprotected remaining (Last Stand) "biological refugia" wildlands, here. Objective, professional, Authorized experts - generations of knowledgeable biologists, soil scientists, geologists, biogeography trackers, hydrologists, botanists, wild forage experts, environmental engineers - report that the continuing human industry-caused losses from 1990s culture planning and engineering, are now (in legalese) "uncompensable". Worst of all, construction of last century corporate utility scale "large array" infrastructure (massive lines, towers, Links, stations, seas of panels and battery housing) is - still - hurriedly being inserted across, and deep into, the Last Stand wildlands, because all of that last century engineering is now (overnight), timing out for its efficiency, effectiveness, - and preferred profitability "expectations". Rapid evolution of photovoltaics has rendered it irrelevant, unacceptably uncompetitive, for its financing corporations, no matter how much "protection" it is given, no matter how much valuable waterbanking desert wilderness is sacrificed for the rush investors' too-late plans to offload old bad bets.</p> <p>At least, you had the federal protections in place. Please don't let the amendments be inserted, and stand against allowing protections to be compromised where you are, where you have a chance to stall investors' plans to build, when they know better systems are going to bypass their business model soon - same as with our fitted, modular - better - Microgrid solutions, coming in.</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you for your sense of timing, and longterm best management for the "base", in this situation.</p>
--	--------	----	--

	Eckroth	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Nielsen	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mendez	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	A Shea	RI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Bell	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Brown	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Ethridge	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Grasso	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Gifford	<p>MD</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	McKenna	<p>RI</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Graap	<p>AZ</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Wheat	<p>NY</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Christenson-Nutt IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>It is way past time that the citizens of this country are over-ruled by corporate "wants"! These pipelines are a clear & present danger to the surrounding ecosystems through which they are proposed to be built on & under! Rules are rules for very good reasons & should not be changed on the whim of ANY company, regardless of the industry. This particular pipeline company has not previously demonstrated that it will adhere to regulations or that it is capable of preventing future disasters! So with that in mind, I am requesting that these arbitrary changes that are being requested be denied on their face!</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Thilman GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>I write to you for future generations, including my Granddaughter.</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Ancin	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Merrifield	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	LaRue	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Palmer	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Mullins	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Mackey	NV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Green	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Welch	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Holstein	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Williams	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mcsweeney	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Morgan	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Fraker	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Swanson	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Auerswald	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Lowther	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Frank	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Grohn	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Gungel	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Murry	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Wortman	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Markon	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Nordine	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Di Benedetto	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sequeira	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Sloan	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Derrough	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Lasley	UT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Galotti	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Schmitt	TN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Mele	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lowe	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hunter	MT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Decker	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Wiggins	CT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Houseal	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Farrow	OK	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>You need to stop the influence of these big corporate lobbyists who don't care about maintaining habitat or climate and only want to greedily rape the land for short term profits. Protect our public lands! The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Farrow	OK	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>You need to stop the influence of these big corporate lobbyists who don't care about maintaining habitat or climate and only want to greedily rape the land for short term profits. Protect our public lands! The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Errichetti	<p>AZ</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Selden	<p>CA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mulcare	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Simon	VT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Fausey	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bittikofer	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lyttle	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Schaefer	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Meyers	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bonczewski	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Pryor-Luzier	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Apostolina	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Rago	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
O'Brien	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Burton	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Reed	LA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Potter	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Bedlan	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Halladay	OK	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Reynolds	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Costoff	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Goodsitt	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Dahlberg	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Duport	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rubinfine	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Blaisdell	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Nezzo	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Weisman	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Moeller	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Caruso	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	arends	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Pacheco	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kelton	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Butler	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Jobling	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Smith	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Cole	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Croson	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Riebschlaeger TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>Our forests are already greatly devastated by droughts and forest fires. Pipelines carry highly toxic and flammable substances that have often exploded when pipelines fail or leak. This was the case in my own Dewitt County when a 42" pipeline ruptured and exploded several years ago. The ungodly heat melted the pavement a quarter of a mile away. If pipelines are permitted through our forests, they will only add to the risks of further disasters.</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Taylor OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	McCartney	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Fort	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Wintamute	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Wenderlich	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Louden	CT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Reichert	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Schluter	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Campbell	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Wilson	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Whiteside	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Casey	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hayes	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sellers	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Brawner	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Cooper	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Heimann	KS	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hester	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Walker	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hooley	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Anderson	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Miller	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Mineo	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Acuff	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Burton	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Waters	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Liberge	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Brady	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Brelsford	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Pretorius	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	sprunger-froese	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Ruane	MT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Palacios	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Smoker	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Pasqua	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you. John pasqua</p>

	Southwick	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Troutman	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Owen	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Wahl	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Boyd	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Whiting	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	James	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	HARRIS	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Downey	CT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Jones	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Pawlukojc	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Harris	SC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Semet	<p>KS</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Pope	<p>CA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Dorfman	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Warren	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Womer	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Wallace	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Twitmyer	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Burnett	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Takayama	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Ramirez	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Callaway	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jymmvefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Millis	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Will	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Littlejohn	MS	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Khalsa	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	McKellop	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sweeney	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Meza	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Harrold	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	McAndrews	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Frankel	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bergstrom	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Roberson	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Karnofsky	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Daigneault	RI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Barbera	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Swiglo	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Burlin	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Swilling	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Desmond	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Quigley	KS	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Palmer	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Silcott	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Bivona	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Bush	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Sadley	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Bura	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Glass	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Henderson	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bone	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Frey BSN RN PH-CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Young	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Conyers	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Higham	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Riccobene	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Haseman	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

moon	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Nail	AR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	BARCILON	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Jack	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Hall	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Samsel	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Torquati	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kozik	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ross	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes: these pipeline are not safe for the area it is going through. Leaking oil lines damage the soil and water systems and kill the animals in their habitat. Stop trying to get the go ahead on these damaging pipelines.</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Cummings	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Wright	SC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Granche	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Williams	TN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Tindall	SC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Deakins	<p>TN</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hudson	<p>TN</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jones	AR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Wise	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Piercy	TN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Chletcos	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Duffer	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Mader	UT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	McDow	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Jordan	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mendelson	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Traub	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Bini	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Miller	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Stroh	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Cross	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Zhang	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Musgrove	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	English	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Foster	OK	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Cicalese	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Martin	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Englert	<p>IL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Dodson	<p>FL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Zink	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Curtis-Lewis	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Varma	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Wermeling	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Yeager	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Shapiro	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Hof	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
De Beziers	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Siders	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Huffman	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Lachner	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Paradis	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Perry	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Richardson	TN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Victorio	CA	<p>comment: IT IS YOUR JOB to protect the land and the people living on land. You should not allow a company to destroy the people, plants, animals, and even the soil, which is what would happen if the project was allowed to continue. The health of nature and of all people, who rely on nature, must take a higher priority than money. You must put an end to the construction of the Mountain Valley Pipeline.</p>

	Barish	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Lowery	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sargent MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Deaner-Rogers WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

School	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Brown	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Forral	ID	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Christopherson	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Menteer	MT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Harper	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Magallanes	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Karl	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bodnar	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Passuntino	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kress	<p>MN</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Parker	<p>TN</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Meiners	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Scott	TN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Gold	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Brennan	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Brinker	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Louro	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Winn	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Fries	AK	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Albert	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Follow the rules that have already been defined. Don't change them for a gas /oil pipeline. That's what we did to the Native American tribes time and time again.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Rodriguez	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	walker	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Wiener	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Margaret Wiener Thank you.</p>

	Mickelsen	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Lyon	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hecathorn	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Johnson	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bracamonte	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Poland	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Axelrood	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Heaney	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Ortega	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Lollie	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Hatch	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Fairchild	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Baumgarten CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Conlon VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Sullivan	<p>OR</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Dabancens	<p>VA</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Dreiling	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Barsanti	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Molchanov	AK	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Mcliver	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Smith	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, or real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue its project because of the associated environmental risks. The 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species, and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, and the negative environmental effects can no longer be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and their loss cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project would set a disturbing precedent for what is tolerable on national forests across the country. The applicant has demonstrated its inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices since production of this pipeline began. As a result, significant delays have arisen as a result of multiple federal authorizations being vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has suggested there is a desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts toward nonfossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the above reasons, we once again request the U.S. Forest Service select Alternative (1) No for "No Action" and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Sutton	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Cannon	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Tani	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hersko-RonaTas CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>Please protect our treasured forests. We must. The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Isett	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Botsko	<p>FL</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Sanger	<p>MO</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kane	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Reagan	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Peterman	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Johnson	NV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Wooten	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Luck	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Noel	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Schemehorn	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Boulanger	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Donnaway	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Nolan	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kendall	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kearns	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Norland	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Phillips	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Unger	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Cornett	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Halpern	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kerzner	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Manser	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Jacobs	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Tucker	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Athair	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kessinger	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mbuga	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Harris	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Miles	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Sanders	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hughes	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Osborn	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	bigelow	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hutchings	OK	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Schmitz	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Beasley	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Geier	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Schafer	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kalison	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Dailey	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hegeman	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bates	TN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Adams	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Limebrook	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Limebrook	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Moscoso	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Maioli	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Byerley	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Johnson	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hartford	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>Please Reconsider.</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Yanez	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Josephson	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Lapides	TN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Scott	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Garrard	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Gallin	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hartman	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Cook	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Cameron	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Watkins	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kuperus	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Barringer	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Keraudren	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Jones	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Olson	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Holguin	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kensinger	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Boltz	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

S.	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Shaw	OR	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Pedersen	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	McCormick	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bramlette	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Summers	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Cooper	HI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Brothers	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Moss-Pham	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Chenevert	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Berger	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Strand	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Caldwell	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Sutton	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Kelsberg	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Ferguson	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Schrock	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	A Peace	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mackison	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	FRENCH	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lovitt	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Hebeisen	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	McKuhlen	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Reynolds	VT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Webb	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
LeGrande	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Henderson	OK	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Wiorski	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Smith	TN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Ellison	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mrazek	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Betzhold	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bludgen	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Goldman	WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Wrenn	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lancaster-Rieme	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Reynolds	KY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Dempster	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Matte	NV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Flynn	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Turner	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Peterson	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Murphy	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Walker	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mitchell	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Cohen	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Ferrara	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Barry	PA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Dow	MA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Russell	TN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Steele	NV	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Marsis	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>No to another pipeline project that irrevocably disturbs virgin lands to bring gas to a flood plain and wastes energy resources that could be used for wind projects.</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jones	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Odom	NH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Childers	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Abrams	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rogers	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Erwin	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Davis	TN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Portelly	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Thomas	CT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Carey	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Halloran	CT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Snope	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Flora	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Grice	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Church	WI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Burow	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Smith	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Farago	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Pollard	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	bronson	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Gissendanner NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Brickner OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Stransky	<p>AZ</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Rohde	<p>WI</p> <p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hinze	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Bilyeu	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Collins	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Fries	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Potter	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Nordine	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Gosney-Wrede WA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Borton NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	OConnor	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kurth	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Allred	VA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes: This is crazy and harmful. You do know how to protect t people in the path of such a destructive proposal. Stop it. We are the stewards of this beautiful earth. It is about time we show that we know it and keep it habitable.</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you. Patricia Allred 2 Cole Lane Williamsburg, VA 33185</p>
Mitchell	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Weiner	MD	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Taylor	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Turner	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Marnier	IA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Hanks	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Kennedy	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Craven	GA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Perkins	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Khan	NJ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Hopkins	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Benko	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Velapoldi	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Nichols	NY	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Newman	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ryan	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Judd	MO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Munroe-Younis	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Meagher	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Bowen	MI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Fisher	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Andrews	CT	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	DeMoss	IN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Duwa	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Garcia	IL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Mikals	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Grossheider	MN	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Rogers	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Sadleir-Hart	AK	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Moore	FL	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Crooks	OH	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Comer	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Comer	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Heston	NC	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	phelps	NM	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

OSBORN	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan. ABSOLUTELY NO TO THE MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE ! ! ! THIS FURTHER DESTROY MORE OF OUR NATURAL RESOURCES ! ! !</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Teuffel	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Reed	TX	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Siegel	CA	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Harris	AZ	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
levering	CO	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

	Cadiz	HI	<p>comment: Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Angie	M	IL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

LAURA	SANDROCK	HI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
DREW	BERGSTROM	IL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Deborah	Toppings	TN	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Wendi	Cohen	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Janet	McCalister	NC	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Steven	Urquhart	VA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

walter	pozarycki	OR	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Chris	Boyd	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

William	DePriest	MO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Benita	Lipford	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

JIMMY	STEPHENS	TN	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Eric	Newman	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

John	Welsh	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Suzanne	Cerniglia	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jim	Melia	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Shawn	Smith	NE	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Carolyn	De Mirjian	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Sandra	Kissam	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Chris	Grill	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Marilyn	Hahn	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ted	Forbes	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
gilbert	Rondy	OH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Susan	Lefler	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kyle	Embler	GA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Davis	Montalvan	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
gregory allen	iverson	IA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Craig	Collins	<p>CA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Karen	McCaw	<p>CA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jason	Park	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Cynthia	DePriest	MO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Diane	Lessr	SC	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Susan	Garrison	MO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Robert	Kelley	NC	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kathleen R	Davis	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ryan	Baka	MN	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kristina	Manners	DE	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

John	Paladin	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Tammi	Stewart	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Kiem	Nguyen	<p>CA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lisanne	Freese	<p>IL</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards essential to protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling or real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service should not break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of Jefferson NF.</p> <p>Old-growth forests play an important role in creating topsoil, its loss cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated an inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, the applicant has accrued over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>The applicant claims a need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For all the reasons above, select Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Harry	Hinkle	IL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards essential to protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling or real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service should not break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of Jefferson NF.</p> <p>Old-growth forests play an important role in creating topsoil, its loss cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated an inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, the applicant has accrued over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>The applicant claims a need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For all the reasons above, select Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Conley	Peyton	NH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Dawn	Devoy	CO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards essential to protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling or real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service should not break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of Jefferson NF.</p> <p>Old-growth forests play an important role in creating topsoil, its loss cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated an inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, the applicant has accrued over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>The applicant claims a need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For all the reasons above, select Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Michael	Horner	MI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jeremy	Carpenter	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Joseph	Contardo	CO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Greg	Pawelko	MO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jeff	Morris	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

John	LaBrasca	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
APARECIDA	VIEIRA	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Rebecca	Burnett	KY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
marylyn	lamstein	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Melissa	K	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Joyce	Decuba	NC	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Joe	Atkinson	AR	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jose	Olivas	KS	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Karina	Levine	AZ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Joseph	Bates	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Rhonda	Bast	WI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lynn	Sableman	MO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

laura	Lynch	CT	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Gail	Whitten	OK	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

J Scott	Clarke	MI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jered	Cargman	AZ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Wally	Minnick	<p>MD</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jennifer	Lawson	<p>CA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Roberta	Friedman	NJ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Carl	Moore	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Allen and Phyllis Schwab	MO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Bob Johnson	OH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Faxon	Hall	<p>FL</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Donna	McCollum	<p>OH</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Arlene	Pantalone	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Patti	Highland	MN	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Robert	Porrello	CO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Thomas	Ervin	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Shelby	H.	TN	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Eric	Naji	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Mary	Reiding	CO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Richard	Poirier	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Nicolas	Davies	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Michael	Edwards	CO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Leslie	Spurling	<p data-bbox="570 149 708 170">Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p data-bbox="570 216 1463 300">The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="570 344 1471 428">The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p data-bbox="570 472 1484 535">Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p data-bbox="570 579 1468 600">We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p data-bbox="570 644 1484 749">Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p data-bbox="570 793 1442 856">Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p data-bbox="570 900 1458 963">For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p data-bbox="570 1008 1406 1050">We stand unalterably against running pipelines, drilling, or mining in our National Forests, Parks, and Refuges.</p> <p data-bbox="570 1094 667 1115">Thank you.</p>
--------	----------	--

Sue	Ward-McCurdy	OR	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Gloria	Kelly	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

meg	gilman	NH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Marilyn	Justus	MI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Nicole	Tergeoglou	HI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
mary	campbell hart	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Bee	Herrmann	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Roberta	Heider	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ziggy	Roolz	<p>CA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
JAMES J. & BER FINN/MALONEY	NC	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Annemone	Barnett	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
kwame-Osagyefo	Kalimara	GA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Maya	Rainey	AK	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
WINIFRED KATH	WALSH-FINN	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

MaryKay	Rodarte	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Ann M	Hartner	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Liz	Amsden	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lynn	Taylor	RI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Maureen	McCarthy	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Andrea	Kassner	MT	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

David	Vally	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Doris	Soraci	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Christine	Cubitt	AZ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Valerie	Carrick	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Pat	Berte	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jody	Caicco	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Sue	Russ	VA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Barbara	Kelly	SC	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Mona	Ruttenberg	VA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Ann	Hogg	CO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Richard	Nelson	IL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest. Wake up, do your jobs Thank you.</p>
Elaine	Fletcher	AZ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

W	Boyco	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Marilyn	Domke	IL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Eric	Ranvig	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kay	Kiechel-White	NE	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Carol	Kerridge	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Ed	Hammerli	LA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Carolyn	Spehar	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>It is high time we do not capitulate to the fossil fuel industry and preserve the beauty of this country. Some things are sacred!</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Janet	Bieber	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Adria	Siraco	<p>FL</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules to accommodate the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, when it has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again urge the U.S. Forest Service select Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jovette	Gura	<p>FL</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Diane	McMahon	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Ellen	Wasfi	DE	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Roger	Hollander	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Holly	Rothkopf	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Derek	Binelli	NJ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jennifer	Hussain	IN	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jennifer	Stewart	CO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Thomas	Hernandez	NV	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Patricia	Bocanegra	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Judith	Hauck	NH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jim	Head	MI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Mary Ida	Johnson	AZ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Kristy	Bonoyer	RI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Michael	DiDiego	NV	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jerry	Fisher	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jody	Smith	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country.</p> <p>Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

B. R.	Lemonik	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Wendy	Nine	NM	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Robin	Weirich	<p>CA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
David	Luu	<p>CA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

George	Waterman	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jeff	Martin	OR	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Isabella	Randazzo	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Patricia	Uyek	OH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

David	Skellie	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kristin	Fitzpatrick	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Macrina	Rodriguez	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Rebecca	Evans	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ronald	Pust	AZ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
lee	whitehall	KY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

John	Jutras	CT	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
sandra	hazzard	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Stephen	Merring	MI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Skyler	Ferris	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Holly	Whittaker	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Richard	D'Apollo	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Friend	Friend	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Laura	Scott	VA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Tim	YATES	NC	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
E	C	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Anne	Drinkwater	WI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Theresa	Owens	SC	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Nadrat	Siddique	MD	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Elizabeth	Engelhardt	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Kathryn	Coutcher	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Nancy	Pope	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jane	Davidson	NH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Sofia	Quinn	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Katherine	Robertson	CO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Judith	Amlin	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Philip	Ratcliff	OR	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Rema4584	Loeb	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

James	Hutchison	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Rico	Lara	IL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Rock	Dash	MI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Pamela	Miller	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Eric	Andersen	WI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Carol	Ellenberger	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Victoria	Brandon	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Mariana	Wittich	OH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Claudio	Niedworok	NC	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Laura	Kaplan	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Julia	Natvig	SD	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Polly	White	AZ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Milly	Tangney	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Rudene	Rachiele	NV	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ellen	Osborne	NC	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Marco	Pardi	GA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jerry	Cronin	NM	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Robert	Veralli	NJ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Marcia	Sherman	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Patricia	Haupt	IL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Bonnie	Cowles	MI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
John	Navarro	VA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Elaine	Preston	MD	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jan	Peebles	WI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Robin	du Plessis	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Gopal	Warrier	OH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Susan	Welch	IL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
joe	smith	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jeanne	Held-Warmkessel PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Heather	Kemper	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Laura	Ogar	MI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Christine	Taylor	NJ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

<p>Laura</p>	<p>Foy</p>	<p>VA</p>	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<p>Paricia</p>	<p>Roles</p>	<p>KY</p>	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Janet	Wylde	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Karen	Kapes	OH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Terri	Richmond	AR	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Thomas	Kessler	ME	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ellen	Homsey	DE	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Ralph	Theis	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Barbara	Levenstien	NV	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
BEN	WILDMAN	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Pam	Hubbard	NH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lorne	Beatty	MI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Nancy	Johnson	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Fred	Pier	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Fred	Swift	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
J	Lewis	AZ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

will	landstrom	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Dan	Hoey	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Nancy	Luis	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lynda	Lemke	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Sagar	Patel	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Joshua	Frisbie	OR	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

C	W	CO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Joanne	Kreider	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes: Joanne Kreider</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jeanne	Faust	MD	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Thomas	Gamper	MD	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Dennis	Grousosky	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Andy	Lynn	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Rachael	Stone	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Joyce	Frohn	WI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lys	Burden	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>My family and I (four voting and tax-paying adults) understand Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 important standards that are essential for protecting Jefferson National Forest. We understand that the company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>We agree that the Forest Service absolutely cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the profit-based Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, which, we understand, has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. We strongly agree these 11 proposed changes would be significantly detrimental to soil health, old-growth forest, many species and detriment to people and local communities near Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>We know forest ecosystems are vulnerable, especially with current climate conditions and any continued negative environmental impacts cannot be tolerated. We are well aware that old-growth forests and older-growth areas play an imperative role in maintaining healthy, living soils, which act as a very effective carbon-sink. This loss of healthy soil cannot be mitigated and should not be tolerated in our currently escalating climate chaos.</p> <p>We think it is imperative that the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the 11 proposed changes, all of them!</p> <p>We agree that rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project for USFS land will set a disturbing precedent for potential changes on national forests across the country. We understand since production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia. With a track record like this, Mountain Valley Pipeline should be granted no more concessions... NONE! They have shown they are a bad "player;" they have not earned any rule changes!</p> <p>Furthermore, we understand the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, and that it is speculative and unproven. We understand there are existing supply alternatives, and we know the market is shifting toward non-fossil fuel alternatives to accommodate climate impact.</p> <p>For these many reasons cited above, my family and I ask again that the U.S. Forest Service select Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest and continuing to allow damage to our imperiled climate health.</p> <p>Thank you. Dan and Lys Burden Mike and Dan Brant</p>
-----	--------	----	---

Shani	Schulman	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Judith	Heffron	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lorraine	Priceman	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Sandra	Eberle	GA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Rich	K	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to this pipeline project.</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you. Richard krikorian</p>
------	---	----	---

Liane	Overman	KS	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Marilyn	Slickman	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

John	Crick	OH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Deborah	Boyd	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Gayle	Leberg	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
danny	williams	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Connie	Lowber	NJ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Austin	Ellois	LA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Dylan	Nguyen	<p>CA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Julia	VETRIE	<p>CA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

David	Funk	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jan	Paraham	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Chris	Brunner	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
George	Martin	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Sharon	Goel	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Annmarie	Schaffer	AZ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Beverly Jeanne	Lewis	GA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
----------------	-------	----	--

Jim	Steitz	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>I implore you to redeem the moral record of the Forest Service toward our Appalachian Mountains and our climate by rejecting the request to amend the forest plans of the George Washington and Jefferson National Forests to accommodate the 'Mountain Valley Pipeline,' a project that patently and brazenly contradicts the purpose of the National Forests, and the objectives of the existing GW&J Forest Plans in particular. The MVP has already inflicted atrocious damage across a wide swath of forests, streams, and farmland. If construction is completed, MVP will help to lock America into a generation of methane consumption, and raw methane leaks into our atmosphere, that our rapidly deteriorating climate cannot survive.</p> <p>Fragile and irreplaceable ecosystems, including some of the finest remaining forests in America, lie squarely in the crosshairs of the pipeline. It defies belief that the staff of either MVP or the Forest Service has become so numbed to this cosmic expression of life and beauty, that they would condone its destruction for a giant metal conduit. This pipeline, is allowed to continue construction, will be remembered with hatred and contempt by our children, as will the FERC staff who permitted such a heinously immoral arson of Earth's biological gems. The pipeline will stand as tangible testament to the modern repetition of our sad errors of exploitation, to the historical lessons that the Forest Service has failed to learn, and to this administration's fanatical obsession with pipelines which respects nothing else as valuable or sacred.</p> <p>The pipeline's breach of the George Washington and Jefferson National Forests is an egregious violation of the public trust placed in our government to protect and steward a national treasure, acquired at great effort and expense by a prior generation. The visionaries who assembled and consecrated the GW&J National Forests for future generations did so with the insight that a future cohort of industrialists might covet the land for a myopic project like a pipeline, and hoped that the National Forest status might preclude exactly such a project as this. The project applicant has not shown that the use of National Forest lands is an absolute necessity for the pipeline to exist, rather than a cost-saving convenience. The Forest Service already has a policy that mere financial efficiency is not sufficient reason for a consumptive, irreversible loss of National Forest lands and resources. Granting a right-of-way for the 'Mountain Valley' pipeline absent such a showing of necessity by the applicant violates Forest Service policy and makes your agency a mere land bank for private developers, not a land manager in the public interest.</p> <p>Further moral travesty is manifest in the utter lack of physical need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline. Vast margins of waste and inefficiency remain in the use of methane gas, both for heating and in the use of electricity generated by gas-fired plants. So long as this remains true, and as long as the Mid-Atlantic States continue their promising increase in the production of photovoltaic solar and wind electricity, the Mountain Valley Pipeline, with mathematical certainty, cannot be a preferred alternative for meeting any purpose and need regarding energy.</p> <p>The frenetic expansion of gas infrastructure is deliciously appealing to the future revenues of pipeline companies and electrical companies who can reclaim any capital cost from ratepayers, but they are contrary to the interests of the general public, both among the prospective consumers of the gas, and all Americans with an interest in a habitable climate. By approving these pipelines, the Forest Service acts as a slavish handmaiden to these for-profit interests, and disavows any pretense of acting as a public regulatory agency. By collaborating with MVP and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's compulsory confiscation of private property, the Forest Service becomes an agent of corporate authoritarianism, and solidifies the alliance of state and corporate power known to political scientists as fascism.</p> <p>MVP construction to date has already been an ecological catastrophe, with massive destruction of forests and suffocation of streams. Contrary to the euphemistic and Orwellian language of the environmental documentation, these impacts cannot and will not ever be 'mitigated.' They represent the permanent disassembly of the Earth's life support systems, and the systematic peeling of Earth's biosphere from its surface. This is a moral atrocity that requires an extraordinary level of depravity to propose or license. The value of this ecosystem, both in sustaining a planet habitable to humans, and in fulfilling the right to exist of its resident biodiversity, dwarfs the petty rewards sought by pipeline and electrical companies.</p> <p>Even the feeble, token requirements of erosion control in the MVP construction permit have been repeatedly violated, with no material consequences for the pipeline operator that might get a company official's attention. Heavy machinery has crushed, excavated, and shredded soils that required decades or centuries to form, including in fragile wetland and riparian habitats left as mud pits. MVP contractors have treated the erosion control requirements as a joke, and are invited to do so by the absolute, unchecked latitude of the 'when practicable' clauses that litter the permit conditions. We may safely predict that MVP will continue cutting the Appalachian landscape to shards, in the interest of construction schedules and cost control, if allowed this torturous, reworked permit by the Forest Service.</p> <p>Again, I implore you to redeem the legacy of the Forest Service, and mend your gross moral error regarding the Mountain Valley Pipeline, by declining to nullify your Forest Plans, as is plainly a prerequisite for this outrageous pipeline to proceed. The original permits for MVP constituted an act of gross vandalism against the crown jewel of biodiversity of America, and gross violence against our children's prospects for surviving in a habitable climate. Our descendants in future Appalachia will look either upon a hideous metal scar gnawing through a denuded landscape, or a proudly low-carbon energy system. To reissue this permit would indicate that you have learned nothing, and would extend a suicide pact to which our children and our fellow creatures have not consented.</p>
-----	--------	--

Mary	Copeland	OH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
ROBERT	OBRIEN	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Margaret	Garlan	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>Please reject and prevent further expansion of the Mountain Valley Pipeline. The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Steve	Caro	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Anna	Bayles	MI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Nolan	Turner	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Margie	Halladin	<p>CA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Cindy	Loomis	<p>CA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Michael	Mikus	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Steven	Uyenishi	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Randi	Justin	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lauren	Ranz	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Eugene	Nix	AK	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Ron	Kuhler	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Robert	Duy	MO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Eric	Fournier	NH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Francis	S.	IL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Beth	Massimino	NV	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Amy	Marshall	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Mary	Junek	WI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Deryl	Feeter	MI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kim	Miceli	OH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Patrice	Wallace	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Leon	Wingate	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

<p>Johanne</p>	<p>Beerbaum</p>	<p>CT</p>	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<p>George</p>	<p>Thompson Sr.</p>	<p>AZ</p>	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Beth	Jones	IL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
George	Ruiz	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

David	Ramirez	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Mikael	Estarrona	AZ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

<p>02/17/2023 - Dusty Cordell added to CARA as a Forms Plus</p>			<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>Nooooooooooooo!!!! Big oil's time is Up!!! They served their purpose, to get us to where we are, but we have Far Better and Safer means to power ALL OF OUR NEEDS, in this day and age, it's time to Move On!! C'mon, It's just Wrong, AND EVERYBODY KNOWS IT!! Even if they're for it, they Know it's a Bad idea!! Fossil fuels have caused enough damage, with buckets more to come! And that's if we completely stop Everything fossil fuel, RIGHT NOW!! To keep going with any of it is just pure Insanity!! I hope they don't have kids and grandkids that they think they're setting up for the good life, because it's going to be any thing but, while they're fighting for their lives on a planet that's getting way too hot to deal with. While making growing food almost impossible, droughts, floods and hurricanes ripping the country apart, in damage, and lives lost!! That's what their kids and grandkids will Not be enjoying, think about it all before you mistakenly ok this disaster waiting to be unleashed.....jus'sayin, look real hard before you leap.</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<p>Dusty</p>	<p>Cordell</p>	<p>CO</p>	

Janet	Bischoff	<p>PA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Janet	Stiles Tyson	<p>MI</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

geoffrey	weeks	OH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Sara	Johnson	NH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Shari	Johnson	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lily	Hopwood	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Perry	Kendall	<p>PA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Angela	Hoehne	<p>AL</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Daniel	Ploetz	MS	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Margaret	Ewing	CT	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Sondra	Rodgers	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
patoue	riboton	CT	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Thomas	Nicholson	OH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Gary	Graham	WV	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Nancy	Cowger	IL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
jill	harmer	KY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Mike	W	MN	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kathleen	Konle-Barth	WI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Douglas	Froebe	LA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Rachel	Speed	MO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Joan	Brooks	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Marcine	McBride	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

KEVIN	MEE	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Missy	Harris	TN	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Paula	Beck	VA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lydia	Saderman	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jeff	Milks	IA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Wendy	Ebersberger	VA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

James	Corr	OH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
William	Gleeson	NH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Richard	Kettye	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Carolyn	Haupt	VA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Penny	Redman	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Laura	Fung	MI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Paul	Kruse	WI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Emilie	Beard	IN	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Brigitte	Inabnitt	OH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Mary	Christman	MI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Catherine	Medina	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Nancy	Rivers	MD	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

jerry	owings	IA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jessica	Wolf-Golbach	IL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Stephen	Poss	LA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jessica	Dubose	IL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lewis	Sotnick	CT	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Leslie	Dare	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Denise	Herbert	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
ralph	bocchetti	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

William	Smith	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
THOMAS	BAER	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Tanya	Bourgoin	CT	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
N	Jeglin	IL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Joel	Cruzada	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Janet	O'Hare	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Dean	Anderson	CT	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kathleen	Kern	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Holly	Bevan	CO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>When will we finally understand that the harm we have done and continue to do to the natural world around us is doing irreparable damage to us humans. Life on planet Earth is interdependent and every time we humans seek to dominate and consume for ourselves alone, we destroy that much more of what we depend on to survive. The self-proclaimed smartest species is the most clueless and self-destructive.</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
-------	-------	----	---

Lisa	Acher	NH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Susan	Elam	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Claire	McKinney	WI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Emalee	Andre	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Chip	Gaylor	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Daniel	Mittermeyer	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Gary	Cox	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Susan	Ulrich	IN	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Penny	Skaff	WV	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Susan	Francis	NH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Sandra	Strength	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Anita	Morgan	MI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Nancy	Jones	CO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
David	O'Keeffe	AZ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Linda	Chivers	WI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Sheila	Delson	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Cindy	Janac	TN	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Amanda	Lowe	ID	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Kirk	Fast	KS	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Robert	Williams	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Michael	Solis	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Knud-Erik	Rosenkrantz	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Betty	Waterbeck	IA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Daved	Wachsman	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Mia	Rognstad	ID	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Richard	Boyce	OH	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

John	Papandrea	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
James	Flasch	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Aaron	Mlynek	MN	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Wendy	Rosenfeld	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ada	Bello	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Francisco	Martinez	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

David	Rodriguez	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
DOUGLAS	KLEIN	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

stu	greenburg	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Gloria	Aguirre	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

nic	griffin	<p>CA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jess	Summers	<p>VA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Noemi	Garza	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Brian K	Sutton	KY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Laurel	Tumarkin	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Oolaa	kaplan	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Carol	Steinsapir	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Megan	Vynne	HI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

John	Baker	CO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Judith	Kohn	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Todd	Davis	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Jane	Randall	MD	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

martha/jeffrey	landaw	MD	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Nancy	Saipetch	MI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Dan	Stanger	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
dc	katten	AZ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Kim	Lewis	GA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Phillip	Mahaffey	OR	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Gabriel	Camp	NV	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Pamela	Carltock	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

<p>Andrea-s Bernha Rullmann-Stekl - ID</p>		<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<p>David</p>	<p>Warren</p>	<p>MI</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Lou	Milks	IA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Charlotte	Elva	MN	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Philip	Jurus	<p>PA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
H	A	<p>PA</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Susan	Beachy	VA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Lori	Alicie	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Martin	Marinoff	<p>MD</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Mark	Hallett	<p>OR</p> <p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Cherryl	Walker	OR	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Tracey	Mangus	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Angel	Garcia	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Ms. Erin	Noelle	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Richard	Windorf	WI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Joanna	Tang	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Steven	Rosenberg	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Georgia	Couch	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Michael	Schmaus	IL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Chris	Hunter	LA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Raquel	Narvios	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Amy	Unruh	TX	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Parisa	Chamlou	VA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Linda	Zan	PA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Martin	Kilmer	OR	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Kari	Martin	MO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Jonathan	Reycraft	MO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Joseph	Mangiantini	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Shayna	Fertig	CA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Bert	Richardson	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Ayana	Morse	MN	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Styra	Eisinger	NJ	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Alyx	Bilyeu	MO	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
LuAnne	Swainson	WA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Nora	Tarbi	MA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Randall	Damon	IA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Kelly	Eaves	GA	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
John	Kim	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

NK	A.	FL	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Maryanna	Moskal	NY	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Kathleen	Books	WI	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Meaghan	Karaffa	NM	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Yvonne	Moody	NC	<p>Dear Dr. Wilkes:</p> <p>The Mountain Valley Pipeline and Equitrans Expansion Project Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement #50036 proposes amendments to 11 crucial standards that are essential for protecting the Jefferson National Forest. The company's newly submitted documents do not provide sufficient assessment, monitoring, modeling, nor real-world analyses to support changes to the Forest Plan.</p> <p>The Forest Service cannot be permitted to break 11 of its own rules as a convenience to the Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, of which has been unable to meet basic minimum criteria to continue their project due to the environmental risks associated. These 11 proposed changes would be detrimental to the soil health, old-growth forest, species and preservation of the Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Forest ecosystems are vulnerable, the negative environmental impacts cannot continue to be diminished. Old-growth forests play an imperative role in creating topsoil, and its loss alone cannot be mitigated and would impair biodiversity.</p> <p>We implore the U.S. Forest Service to select Alternative (1) "No Action" and reject the proposed 11 changes.</p> <p>Rewriting the rules for one fossil fuel project will set a disturbing precedent for what will be tolerated on national forests across the country. Since the production of this pipeline began, the applicant has demonstrated their inability to maintain proper and adequate environmental practices during construction. As a result, significant delays have arisen due to multiple federal authorizations vacated and the accrual of over 500 violations of permit conditions and environmental standards in Virginia and West Virginia.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has alleged the desire and need for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, of which is speculative and unproven. There are existing supply alternatives and market shifts towards non-fossil fuel alternatives.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, we again ask that the U.S. Forest Service selected Alternative (1) No for "No Action," and reject the 11 proposed amendments to prevent unnecessary damage to Jefferson National Forest.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
--------	-------	----	--