

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Monday, October 17, 2011 10:53:40 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: lisa giovanetti

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Sunday, October 16, 2011 11:56:25 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Laura Seale

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Sunday, October 16, 2011 10:35:03 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Kennon Williams

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Saturday, October 15, 2011 7:26:16 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: liz browning

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Saturday, October 15, 2011 5:12:41 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Joan Wood

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington-jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Saturday, October 15, 2011 4:16:03 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Jufith Copenhaver

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Saturday, October 15, 2011 4:05:58 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Dorothy Landry

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Saturday, October 15, 2011 4:02:16 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Cynthia Fordney

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Saturday, October 15, 2011 3:12:21 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Melissa

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Saturday, October 15, 2011 2:55:35 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Vanthi Nguyen

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Saturday, October 15, 2011 12:09:50 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Annie O'Brien

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.
Annie O'Brien

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington-jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Saturday, October 15, 2011 12:09:23 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Annie O'Brien

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Saturday, October 15, 2011 11:53:37 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Shirley Stewart

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Saturday, October 15, 2011 10:03:11 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Ken Goldsmith

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From:
To: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
Subject: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Date: Saturday, October 15, 2011 8:26:28 AM

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Kristy Pingry

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Saturday, October 15, 2011 8:16:40 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Ralph Grove

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 7:09:04 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Ronald Fandetti

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 5:59:22 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Blake Clark

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 3:47:03 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Ruth van Veenendaal

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 2:42:37 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Gary Banks

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 1:11:21 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: linda M. Samuels

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 1:09:04 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Ananda C. Cronin

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 1:08:46 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Linda M. Samuels

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jeffersor](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 1:04:38 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: stephanie Tanner

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 1:03:30 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: saul yale barodofsky

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 12:36:18 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Jesse Aielli

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 11:36:50 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Stephen Smith

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 11:21:52 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Greg Marcinkowski

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 10:47:55 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Matthew Spencer

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 10:39:40 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Xiaoyue Guan

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington-jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 9:35:45 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Tara deCamp

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
To: Friday, October 14, 2011 9:21:16 AM
Subject:
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Sara Bissett

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 9:07:13 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: William Guilford

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

My biggest concern with the draft plan is that oil and gas leasing will be possible in 93% of the forest. The actual and potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately incorporated into the plan, nor fully analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

My second largest concern is that the final plan not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted. Standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Third, prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud, but all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Finally, while I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan, more protective measures are needed. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful.

Closing roads is an excellent way to improve aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
William H. Guilford
Charlottesville, VA

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 8:42:00 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Elena Day

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 8:40:33 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Paul Clark

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 8:40:09 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Paul Clark

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 8:25:51 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Karen Neale

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 8:23:20 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Bev Wann

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
To: Friday, October 14, 2011 8:18:58 AM
Subject:
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Melissa Wender

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Friday, October 14, 2011 8:10:46 AM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Mary Paxton

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Thursday, October 13, 2011 4:22:37 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Amanda Shell

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
To: Thursday, October 13, 2011 1:19:31 PM
Subject:
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Joseph Murray

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
To: Thursday, October 13, 2011 11:18:08 AM
Subject:
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Gabriel Mapel (12) and Daniel Mapel (father)

Hi,

We are writing to say that we strongly support no fracking in the GWNF!

Whole tree harvesting of forests for biomass should not be allowed!

And please do not allow large wind turbines on Shenandoah Mountain -- this is a major raptor migration area!

Thanks!

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Wednesday, October 12, 2011 5:30:48 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Diana M. Hawkins

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington -jefferson](#)
To: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Subject: Wednesday, October 12, 2011 5:29:13 PM
Date:

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Diane Hawkins

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington-jefferson](#)
To:
Subject: PLEADING on Draft Plan for GWNF
Date: Friday, October 14, 2011 8:37:34 AM

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Wendy Sugrue

We have the forest because our forefathers preserved it for us. Now it is our turn to do the same for those still to come.

It is the action of a selfish, greedy mind to allow the manipulative people to do such a thing as hydraulic fracturing in areas that are for public use. These manipulative people will not allow blame for their actions to be put back on them. They will take the money and run.

Please do not be fooled and tricked into believing that no harm will be done. Follow your heart.

Sincerely,
Wendy Sugrue

PS:

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington-jefferson](#)
To:
Subject: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF
Date: Friday, October 07, 2011 4:55:08 PM

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Sean Harvey

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington-jefferson](#)
To:
Subject: Comments on Draft Plan for George Washington NF, I support plan \"C.\
Date: Thursday, October 13, 2011 12:32:15 PM

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Debra DeWalt

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: [FS-comments-southern-georgewashington-jefferson](#)
To:
Subject: George Washington NF plans
Date: Sunday, October 09, 2011 12:01:38 PM

You have been sent this message from Wild Virginia's Action Alert

NAME: Bruce Dorries

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan for the George Washington National Forest (GW).

I strongly support the ban on horizontal drilling in the draft plan. I am concerned though, that oil and gas leasing will be possible on roughly 994,000 acres, or 93% of the forest. The full potential impacts of vertical wells, including hydraulic fracturing that accompanies them, have not been adequately analyzed. Oil and gas leasing should not be allowed in the GW where mineral rights are federally owned.

I appreciate the increased focus on drinking water and water resources in the draft plan. More protective measures are needed though. There should be specific management objectives for watersheds that provide public drinking water. The desired conditions described in the draft plan are too general to be useful. Sedimentation is a major threat to water quality everywhere, including the GW. The draft plan should be revised to require measuring sedimentation in strategic locations and waterways.

Closing roads is a very concrete way to decrease sedimentation while improving aquatic and terrestrial habitat and forest health. I am very glad to see road decommissioning targets in the draft plan but believe the goal of 160 miles during the first decade should be increased.

In addressing climate change, standing forests and soils are more valuable as carbon sinks than as a source of renewable energy. The final plan should not allow harvesting fuel (trees) for biomass incineration, industrial scale wind energy projects, or further gas and oil leases. In particular, whole tree harvesting for woody biomass is harmful in many ways and should not be permitted.

Finally, the GW is one of the few places in the eastern U.S. where large areas of undisturbed, mature forest still exist. These forests and the remote settings they provide must be protected. In addition to the public benefits they provide, many wildlife species that need large geographic areas or habitat conditions found here depend upon these special areas.

Prohibiting timber sales and new roads in the 242,000 acres of inventoried roadless areas is a very important step, which I applaud. However, all 372,000 acres identified as potential wilderness areas

should be given this protection. Similarly, to protect rare and uncommon species in the GW, all areas recommended for protection by the Virginia Division of Natural Heritage should be assigned to Special Biological Areas or similar designations.

Creating wilderness study areas (WSA) is also an excellent way to protect large, remote forests. The meager recommendations for WSA in the draft plan (20,300 acres) are disappointing. Each of the four areas recommended are important, but should be increased in size. Many other areas of the GW should be WSA, including Laurel Fork, Big Schloss, Beech Lick Knob, and several potential wilderness areas on Shenandoah Mountain.

Thank you for considering my comments.