

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/11/2019 10:25:26 PM

First name: Janet

Last name: Robinson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The stop and start FERC planning process for routing the pipeline through public lands has been confusing, complex, misleading, and difficult to follow for ordinary citizens. I value and use the forests and watersheds that the Forest Service manages on behalf of the public.

Throughout the extensive FERC planning process, I, like many others, have attempted to voice my concerns over the impacts of pipeline construction on my public lands. Now to the best of my ability, I am attempting to again convey my concern through an administrative objection to the Forest Service over its proposal to re-designate my public forest lands as a permanent giveaway to a foreign energy company. This pipeline only benefits the company that is running the pipeline. It does not benefit the American taxpayers yet we are forced to take all the risks if there is a leak and there most definitely will be a leak.

My objection is that I believe that The Forest Service has not completed its full due diligence to consider what potential effects that this pipeline will have on the watershed, wildlife, and the Umpqua, Rogue River-Siskiyou, and Fremont-Winema National Forest lands. Also, as stated above, we should not be giving our public lands to foreign entities so they can profit from our bounty.

The NEPA process is flawed. The Forest Service has:

1. failed to consider an alternative that doesn't require exempting this applicant from their forest plans as written.
2. The cumulative effects of this proposal on the watershed, wildlife, and fire management have not been analyzed for "the purpose and the effects" as required by law.
3. The pipeline construction fails to meet requirements of the Northwest Forest Plan aquatic conservation strategy and survey and manage programs, and should not be exempt from them.

I, Janet Robinson, respectfully request that the Forest Service withdraw the recommended project and -

1. Prepare a project that meets the standards and guidelines of the existing land use management plan; or
2. Deny the project.

I would prefer option 2 because there is no reason for America to gift our national forests to a foreign-owned entity.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Janet Robinson