

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 6/25/2019 10:49:24 PM
First name: James
Last name: Atkinson
Organization:
Title:
Comments:
Landscape Resiliency Project: Santa Fe Mountains

Jun 25, 2019

Forest Supervisor James Melonas

Dear Forest Supervisor Melonas,

I understand you will receive many messages regarding this project. I hope you understand the public relies on professionals to advise them regarding impacts of proposed Forest Service actions, and therefore many of the comments you receive will seem duplicative. It is wrong to diminish the significance of comments on this basis. With that in mind, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Scoping Document for the Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project. I share the concerns of other environmentalists in the following areas:

1. An EA is for a project of this scale and complexity that impacts many threatened and sensitive species, old growth forests, roadless areas and streams and riparian areas. Because this project will have significant impacts to these and other resources, a thorough, site-specific analysis of all environmental impacts in an Environmental Impact Statement is required.
2. The Forest Service must analyze a full range of alternatives to the agency's proposal, including the Santa Fe Conservation Alternative submitted by WildEarth Guardians and others.
3. The Forest Service must identify and implement the minimum road system on a landscape scale and employ a thoughtful, strategic approach to assuring public access while reducing negative impacts from forest roads to water quality and aquatic habitats, and improving watersheds and forest resiliency by returning expensive, deteriorating, and seldom-used forest roads to the wild.
4. The Forest Service must consider the best available science. The agency cannot cherry-pick the science and data to support its proposal while ignoring contrary, credible views and data.
5. Climate change intensifies the adverse impacts associated with tree thinning, prescribed burning, and roads. The Forest Service must consider the risks of increased disturbance when analyzing the proposed project, as part of the affected environment, and as part of the agency's hard look at impacts.
6. The Forest Service must analyze the cumulative impacts of the proposed project with all other past, present and foreseeable future projects within the broader landscape, including the Hyde Park and Pacheco Canyon projects, livestock grazing, and motorized use.

Sincerely,

James Atkinson
427 Larkway Dr
O Fallon, IL 62269-6506
jatkinson@ou.edu

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 6/25/2019 10:49:24 PM
First name: James
Last name: Atkinson
Organization:
Title:
Comments:
Landscape Resiliency Project: Santa Fe Mountains

Jun 25, 2019

Forest Supervisor James Melonas

Dear Forest Supervisor Melonas,

I understand you will receive many messages regarding this project. I hope you understand the public relies on professionals to advise them regarding impacts of proposed Forest Service actions, and therefore many of the comments you receive will seem duplicative. It is wrong to diminish the significance of comments on this basis. With that in mind, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Scoping Document for the Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project. I share the concerns of other environmentalists in the following areas:

1. An EA is for a project of this scale and complexity that impacts many threatened and sensitive species, old growth forests, roadless areas and streams and riparian areas. Because this project will have significant impacts to these and other resources, a thorough, site-specific analysis of all environmental impacts in an Environmental Impact Statement is required.
2. The Forest Service must analyze a full range of alternatives to the agency's proposal, including the Santa Fe Conservation Alternative submitted by WildEarth Guardians and others.
3. The Forest Service must identify and implement the minimum road system on a landscape scale and employ a thoughtful, strategic approach to assuring public access while reducing negative impacts from forest roads to water quality and aquatic habitats, and improving watersheds and forest resiliency by returning expensive, deteriorating, and seldom-used forest roads to the wild.
4. The Forest Service must consider the best available science. The agency cannot cherry-pick the science and data to support its proposal while ignoring contrary, credible views and data.
5. Climate change intensifies the adverse impacts associated with tree thinning, prescribed burning, and roads. The Forest Service must consider the risks of increased disturbance when analyzing the proposed project, as part of the affected environment, and as part of the agency's hard look at impacts.
6. The Forest Service must analyze the cumulative impacts of the proposed project with all other past, present and foreseeable future projects within the broader landscape, including the Hyde Park and Pacheco Canyon projects, livestock grazing, and motorized use.

Sincerely,

James Atkinson
427 Larkway Dr
O Fallon, IL 62269-6506
jatkinson@ou.edu

