

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/30/2019 8:00:00 AM

First name: Beverly

Last name: Wilson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: December 30, 2019

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, Rogue River-Siskiyou, and Fremont-Winema National Forests

Dear Forest Service:

In accordance with 36 C.F.R. Part 218, I, Beverly Wilson, 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.

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 Rouge 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.

OBJECTOR: Beverly Wilson,

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, Beverly Wilson, hereby request a public meeting to discuss potential resolution of the issues raised in this objection.

The Forest Service has failed to disclose site-specific effects that the pipeline would have and to consider all of the concerns associated with the pipeline. The Forest Service has also failed to consider reasonable alternatives to the project.

I, Beverly Wilson, respectfully request that the Forest Service withdraw the recommended

Project and prepare a project that meets the standards and guidelines of the existing land use management plan or deny the project.

I have written before about what a bad idea this pipeline is altogether. We as Oregonians should be leaders in addressing the catastrophic impact that greenhouse gasses are having on our climate and ultimately the organisms that sustain our ecosystems/forests. The short sightedness of this project is unbelievable! I worked for the Forest Service for 10 years and believed it to care about the well being of our forests and that the Forest Service would do a good job in balancing economic and recreational demands with sustaining healthy ecosystems. I have been expressing my concerns that this pipeline would have negative impacts on public lands by commenting through the FERC process. 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.

I am filing this objection for numerous reasons. Below are a few of these reasons.

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,

Beverly J Wilson

Beverly J Wilson