

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/5/2023 5:00:00 AM

First name: Rob

Last name: Leonard

Organization:

Title:

Comments: To Whom it may concern,

Thank you for the notice and opportunity to comment.

To set context for my comments, I start with the USDA's Mission Statement:

To sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the Nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations.

As well as the other opening statement on the USDA's website:

Grounded in world-class science and technology-

and rooted in communities-the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Forest Service connects people to nature and to each other. As a Federal agency in service to the American people, the Forest Service cares for shared natural resources in ways that promote lasting economic, ecological, and social vitality. In doing

this, the agency supports nature in sustaining life.

With this context in mind, to belabor a decision as to whether allow a 42" pipeline through the National Forest lands makes no sense. The decision should be an instantaneous "NO", as it has no contribution or relevance to these proclaimed statements, in fact it is counter to those statements.

The concerns, with regards to preservation of the related natural assets for present and future access, and this 42" "unnatural" pipeline are numerous. This severe impact to natural lands has already been evidenced in how the MVP installation process in itself has been significantly flawed. We have seen this significant adverse impact first hand as we have had a "front row seat". Things such as the designed E&S controls ignored and those applied ineffective as documented by the hundreds of violations issued to these pipeline installers. The obvious lack of application of the measures that the installers proclaimed in their various application packages. It is quite obvious that their mode of operations are go in fast and hard and devastate the natural world and assets and then take the "slap on the wrist" violations. Further, there was much eroded materials (mud, dirt, silt, rock, etc.), caused by these unsupervised, non-enforced activities that crossed over roads, waterways, etc. that could be measured in several inches and feet in depth. So, how do you expect this to go any differently through the Forest lands. Also, we see, firsthand, that the "maintenance" of these pipeline pathways sit for long periods of time before any minimal maintenance is applied, how do you expect this to go any differently in the Forest lands?

When you read, with any depth, in the related documents, the owners of this pipeline have several exit options once they vacate, which they eventually will, to no longer have any maintenance or repair obligations for the pipeline or its pathway.

Lastly, with the aforementioned mission in other statements in mind, this is a 42" pipeline, which has never been constructed and, therefore, is an experiment. Is it fair, responsible, and acting as publicly paid stewards of our public lands to sign off on this multi-generational, highly likely negatively impactful experiment.

So, as you pour over the various documents, studies, applications, please consider these basic core elements that I put forward here along with the irresponsible actions already presented in the theater of work already implemented.

If you want to see, firsthand, for yourselves please feel free to reach out to me anytime.

I wish you and your colleagues all of the best in making the right decision.

Use your conscious and your organizations proclaimed mission and other prominent statements as your guide.

If you have read through this I it's entirety, I truly appreciate your time.

Thank you-

Rob Leonard