

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/18/2019 2:09:34 AM

First name: Elizabeth

Last name: Chandler

Organization:

Title:

Comments: [Insert Date]

TO: PNW Regional Forester, Objections Reviewing Officer

VIA: <https://cara.ecosystem-management.org/Public/CommentInput?project=28132>

Subject: 36 CFR 218 Objection Pacific Connector Pipeline Site Specific Plan Amendments for the Umpqua, Rogue River-Siskiyou, and Fremont-Winema National Forests

Dear Forest Service:

In accordance with 36 C.F.R. Part 218, I, Elizabeth Chandler, hereby object to the project described below.

DOCUMENT TITLE: Opportunity to Object, Plan Amendments for Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline on The Umpqua, Rogue River-Siskiyou, and Fremont-Winema National Forests.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Forest Service proposes to approve 30.6 miles of the Pacific Connector Pipeline route across the National Forest System. This proposal includes approximately 591 acres of forests for the construction of the Pipeline Project and an additional 186 acres of permanent right of way. This decision would allow crossing of 10.8 miles on the Umpqua Nation Forest in Douglas County, 13.7 miles on the Rogue River Siskiyou National Forest in Jackson County, and 6 miles on the Fremont-Winema National Forest in Klamath County.

PROJECT LOCATION (Forest/District): Umpqua, Rogue River-Siskiyou, and Fremont-Winema National Forests, Douglas, Jackson, and Klamath Counties, Oregon.

NAME AND TITLE OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: Alice B. Carlton, Forest Supervisor and Responsible Official, Umpqua National Forest.

TIMELINESS: This objection is timely filed. Notice of the Opportunity to Objection To "Site Specific" Plan Amendments for Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline proposed decision was published in the Federal Register on November 22, 2019). Forty-five days from November 22, 2019 is January 5, 2020.

REQUEST FOR A PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS RESOLUTION: I, Elizabeth Chandler, hereby request a public meeting to discuss potential resolution of the issues raised in this objection.

NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF THOSE ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED DECISION ADDRESSED BY THE OBJECTION:

Why do you oppose the Forest Service's proposal to throw out the rules for Jordan Cove LNG Because:

The Forest Service has failed to disclose site-specific effects that the pipeline would have.

The Forest Service failed to take a hard look at all of the various concerns associated with the pipeline.

The Forest Service failed to consider reasonable alternatives to the project.

SUGGESTED REMEDIES THAT WOULD RESOLVE THE OBJECTION:

I, Elizabeth Chandler, 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.

DESCRIBE HOW THE OBJECTION RELATES TO PRIOR COMMENTS: I have been expressing my concerns that this pipeline would have negative impacts on public lands by commenting through the FERC process. I commented in person twice and delivered written comments as well. Once again, I am trying to convey my concerns through an administrative objection to the Forest Service over its proposal to re-designate my public forest lands as a permanent give-away to a fossil fuel corporation.

STATEMENT OF ISSUES RELATED TO THE PROPOSED SITE-SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS ACTION:

The Forest Service failed to consider an alternative that doesn't require exempting Jordan Cove from adhering to their forest plans.

Late Successional and Riparian Reserves should not be stripped of protections at the behest of a foreign fossil fuel company.

The Forest Service did not consider site-specific impacts that pipeline construction would have and must disclose impacts and plans for mitigation on a site-specific basis.

The pipeline plan undermines the Forest Service's "survey-manage" protocol, created to ensure the protection of federally protected endangered species.

The Forest Service did not analyze or mitigate for increased fire risk from the LNG pipeline.

The cumulative effects of this proposal on watershed, wildlife, and fire management have not been analyzed for their comprehensive "purpose and the effects" as required by law.

The proposal fails to meet requirements of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy and should not be exempt from analysis and mitigation of landslides, sedimentation and waterway degradation.

Signed,

Elizabeth Chandler