

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 6/25/2019 2:49:56 PM
First name: Bruce
Last name: Hlodnicki
Organization:
Title:
Comments:
Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project

Jun 25, 2019

Forest Supervisor James Melonas

Dear Forest Supervisor Melonas,

Thank you for the chance to comment on the Scoping Document for the Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project.

I'm glad the Forest Service soliciting public comment on this project and I hope you will actually consider such comments in your decisions.

I am worried by the Forest Service's proposal:

1. An EA is inappropriate for a project of this scale and complexity. The consequences of acting without a complete assessment endangers many threatened and sensitive species, old growth forests, roadless areas and streams and riparian areas. None of this can ever be replaced once it is destroyed. This project will damage these and other resources, a thorough, site-specific analysis of all environmental effects in an comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement must be required--now.
2. The Forest Service must analyze a complete range of alternatives to the agency's proposal. The Forest Service must include the Santa Fe Conservation Alternative submitted by WildEarth Guardians and others for consideration.
3. The Forest Service must identify and implement the minimum road system on a landscape scale. You must employ a thoughtful, strategic approach to assuring public access. You must also minimize the damage from forest roads to water quality, aquatic habitats, watersheds and forest resiliency by returning expensive, deteriorating, and seldom-used forest roads to the wild.
4. The Forest Service must first and foremost use the best available science! The agency can never cherry-pick the science or the data to advantage its proposal. The Forest Service must never ignore the evidence against its preferred alternative.
5. Climate change will continue to magnify the negative consequences from timber harvesting, prescribed burning, and roads. The Forest Service must fully weigh the risks from increased disruptions when analyzing the proposed project.
6. The Forest Service must realize and adjust its plans to the cumulative harms from the addition of this project to those harms of all the other past, present and foreseeable future projects. Such damage is more than additive; they are negatively synergistic. You must include the entire landscape affected, including the Hyde Park and Pacheco Canyon projects, livestock grazing, and motorized use.

Sincerely,

Bruce Hlodnicki
6235 LAWRENCE DR.

INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46226
bjh55@sbcglobal.net

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 6/25/2019 2:49:56 PM
First name: Bruce
Last name: Hlodnicki
Organization:
Title:
Comments:
Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project

Jun 25, 2019

Forest Supervisor James Melonas

Dear Forest Supervisor Melonas,

Thank you for the chance to comment on the Scoping Document for the Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project.

I'm glad the Forest Service soliciting public comment on this project and I hope you will actually consider such comments in your decisions.

I am worried by the Forest Service's proposal:

1. An EA is inappropriate for a project of this scale and complexity. The consequences of acting without a complete assessment endangers many threatened and sensitive species, old growth forests, roadless areas and streams and riparian areas. None of this can ever be replaced once it is destroyed. This project will damage these and other resources, a thorough, site-specific analysis of all environmental effects in an comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement must be required--now.
2. The Forest Service must analyze a complete range of alternatives to the agency's proposal. The Forest Service must include the Santa Fe Conservation Alternative submitted by WildEarth Guardians and others for consideration.
3. The Forest Service must identify and implement the minimum road system on a landscape scale. You must employ a thoughtful, strategic approach to assuring public access. You must also minimize the damage from forest roads to water quality, aquatic habitats, watersheds and forest resiliency by returning expensive, deteriorating, and seldom-used forest roads to the wild.
4. The Forest Service must first and foremost use the best available science! The agency can never cherry-pick the science or the data to advantage its proposal. The Forest Service must never ignore the evidence against its preferred alternative.
5. Climate change will continue to magnify the negative consequences from timber harvesting, prescribed burning, and roads. The Forest Service must fully weigh the risks from increased disruptions when analyzing the proposed project.
6. The Forest Service must realize and adjust its plans to the cumulative harms from the addition of this project to those harms of all the other past, present and foreseeable future projects. Such damage is more than additive; they are negatively synergistic. You must include the entire landscape affected, including the Hyde Park and Pacheco Canyon projects, livestock grazing, and motorized use.

Sincerely,

Bruce Hlodnicki
6235 LAWRENCE DR.

INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46226
bjh55@sbcglobal.net