

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/20/2023 5:00:00 AM

First name: Barbara

Last name: Daniels

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing to comment on Mountain Valley Pipeline's (MVP) Draft Supplement Impact Statement (DSEIS). regarding Comprehensive Stream and Wetland Monitoring, Restoration, and Mitigation Framework (Framework). The DSEIS has not provided assessment reports, monitoring reports, and other documents that support the conclusions in the DSEIS; therefore, the public cannot review the methodology to determine if DSEIS has any justification to support its conclusions. There is no way the huge machinery, clear-cutting and massive bulldozing--that the 11, Forest Plan exemptions would permit--will preserve wildlife or its habitat. Neither can planting grass restore old growth forest thus destroyed. This ecosystem, so valuable that it is within a UNESCO International Biosphere Reserve, requires protection--not destruction. <https://en.unesco.org/biosphere/eu-na/southern-appalachian> The analysis of the effectiveness of erosion control devices is severely flawed. The DSEIS claims that MVP's erosion controls are effective at controlling erosion, runoff, and sedimentation under normal conditions when properly installed and maintained. However, MVP has a proven track record of improperly installing and not maintaining erosion controls. West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection has cited MVP with over 250 instances where MVP failed to comply with the requirements of their stormwater construction permit resulting in over 50 violations of water quality standards. Aside from impacts to soil, water and ecosystems, we are in the midst of a climate crisis. The DEIS should analyze MVP's contribution to climate change; however, the DSEIS fails to consider the social cost of greenhouse gases when asserting that there are only beneficial effects from MVP. For these reasons, I request the United States Forest Service (USFS) choose the No Action Alternative. Construction of MVP has already proved to be highly impactful to land and water resources which is inconsistent with the Forest Plan; therefore, I urge USFS to refrain from making the 11 amendments to the Jefferson National Forest Plan. Additionally, USFS should not provide concurrence to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to accommodate the MVP with a right of way and temporary use permit to cross the Appalachian Trail, which would degrade the scenic nature of the trail. MVP monitoring is not adequately documenting baseline conditions of waterbodies it will impact. MVP conducted benthic monitoring on a few, select streams but lacks data on the majority of streams to be impacted. Additionally, their methodology, while accepted by WVDEP, has been criticized by EPA. The Performance Standards do not provide reasonable assurance that impacts to water resources will be properly identified. MVP provided arbitrary benchmarks to determine if the water quality shows degradation. However, those benchmarks are based on outdated methodologies that do not properly identify impairments. The Restoration Plan uses an annual monitoring event to identify whether a stream or wetland is meeting the performance standards. If they are not meeting standards, MVP will develop a remediation plan. If that plan proves ineffective, they will simply buy mitigation credits. Simply throwing money at the problem, however, does not solve it. As a result, our water resources will be left damaged.