

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 6/25/2019 2:49:42 PM

First name: Doug

Last name: Booth

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project

Jun 25, 2019

Forest Supervisor James Melonas

Dear Forest Supervisor Melonas,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Scoping Document for the Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project. I appreciate the Forest Service soliciting public comment on this project, but have a number of concerns with the Forest Service's proposal:

1. An EA is inappropriate 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 timber harvest, 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,

Doug Booth
124C La cueva
Glorieta, NM 87535
dougbooth4@gmail.com



Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 7/8/2019 10:24:05 AM

First name: Doug

Last name: Booth

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

"Santa Fe Mountains Resiliency Project" - planned FS tree cutting

Dear Mr. Melonas and others,

I urge a comprehensive Environmental Impact Study be done for such a large project and one with such significant impacts on so many, to determine the effects on the human environment, on roadless areas and on the wildlife. This analysis must be site-specific in order to be meaningful. I am also concerned about the effects on the soil, as you are talking of removing huge amounts of organic matter in taking out those trees that took hundreds of years to grow, and who knows if the land would ever fully recover. I have read a great deal about this, and what you are talking about begins a process called "desertification". I have gone to other areas that have been treated by FS and have seen with my own eyes the degradation to the area, things are not growing back, and areas that were once beautiful look devastated. I also know that FS is not doing the required monitoring after such projects that are in fact required by your their guidelines.

Furthermore I just read a recently released study on climate change, identifying the one most significant thing we can do to curb climate change to be PLANTING trees, stating we could completely turn things around faster this way than any other. So it makes no sense when you look at the big picture, for the FS to be cutting down such significant numbers of trees, especially at this time. It is so short sighted, and I believe completely the wrong approach. I encourage you to read excerpts from a recent study by Tom Crowther, a professor at the Swiss university ETH Zürich, that indicates our best path to stem off climate change is planting trees, and an end to deforestation, attached below.

The FS is exacerbating the greatest problem of our time, and at the same time destroying the natural beauty of our region. This is public land, and it is required by law that the FS listen to the people, and everyone I know opposes this project. At the very least an EIS MUST be required.

Respectfully,

Doug Booth

La Cueva, Glorieta

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 6/25/2019 2:49:42 PM

First name: Doug

Last name: Booth

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project

Jun 25, 2019

Forest Supervisor James Melonas

Dear Forest Supervisor Melonas,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Scoping Document for the Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project. I appreciate the Forest Service soliciting public comment on this project, but have a number of concerns with the Forest Service's proposal:

1. An EA is inappropriate 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 timber harvest, 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,

Doug Booth
124C La cueva
Glorieta, NM 87535
dougbooth4@gmail.com