

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 6/25/2019 11:25:24 PM  
First name: Gayle  
Last name: Janzen  
Organization:  
Title:  
Comments:  
RE: Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project

Jun 26, 2019

Forest Supervisor James Melonas

Dear Forest Supervisor Melonas,

I believe your current proposed Scoping Document for the Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project is problematic and I think the public needs more time to comment. My concerns with your proposal are:

1. I think an EA is inadequate for a project of this scale and complexity as it impacts many threatened and sensitive species, old growth forests, roadless areas and streams and riparian areas. A more thorough, site-specific analysis of ALL environmental impacts in an Environmental Impact Statement should be done.
2. The FS needs to analyze a full range of alternatives to the agency's proposal, specifically the comprehensive Santa Fe Conservation Alternative submitted by WildEarth Guardians and others.
3. The FS should be identifying and implementing the minimum road system on a landscape scale and come up with a well balanced and 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. The landscape needs to remain as wild as possible as the forests need to be protected so they can remain as resilient as possible in this time of drastic climate chaos.
4. It is frustrating that the FS is not considering the best available science and is instead cherry-picking the science and data to support its proposal while ignoring contrary, credible views and data that deserve to be considered. So if the FS prefers to make this proposal based on its own political agenda, then why even open it up for public comment?
5. Climate chaos is intensifying the negative impacts associated with tree thinning, prescribed burning, and roads. The FS needs to take into account 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 FS should analyze the cumulative impacts of the proposed project with all other past, present and foreseeable future projects within the broader landscape, which include the Hyde Park and Pacheco Canyon projects, livestock grazing, and motorized use.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gayle Janzen  
11232 Dayton Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98133

cgjanzen@comcast.net

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 6/25/2019 11:25:24 PM  
First name: Gayle  
Last name: Janzen  
Organization:  
Title:  
Comments:  
RE: Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project

Jun 26, 2019

Forest Supervisor James Melonas

Dear Forest Supervisor Melonas,

I believe your current proposed Scoping Document for the Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project is problematic and I think the public needs more time to comment. My concerns with your proposal are:

1. I think an EA is inadequate for a project of this scale and complexity as it impacts many threatened and sensitive species, old growth forests, roadless areas and streams and riparian areas. A more thorough, site-specific analysis of ALL environmental impacts in an Environmental Impact Statement should be done.
2. The FS needs to analyze a full range of alternatives to the agency's proposal, specifically the comprehensive Santa Fe Conservation Alternative submitted by WildEarth Guardians and others.
3. The FS should be identifying and implementing the minimum road system on a landscape scale and come up with a well balanced and 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. The landscape needs to remain as wild as possible as the forests need to be protected so they can remain as resilient as possible in this time of drastic climate chaos.
4. It is frustrating that the FS is not considering the best available science and is instead cherry-picking the science and data to support its proposal while ignoring contrary, credible views and data that deserve to be considered. So if the FS prefers to make this proposal based on its own political agenda, then why even open it up for public comment?
5. Climate chaos is intensifying the negative impacts associated with tree thinning, prescribed burning, and roads. The FS needs to take into account 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 FS should analyze the cumulative impacts of the proposed project with all other past, present and foreseeable future projects within the broader landscape, which include the Hyde Park and Pacheco Canyon projects, livestock grazing, and motorized use.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gayle Janzen  
11232 Dayton Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98133

cgjanzen@comcast.net

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 6/25/2019 11:25:24 PM  
First name: Gayle  
Last name: Janzen  
Organization:  
Title:  
Comments:  
RE: Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project

Jun 26, 2019

Forest Supervisor James Melonas

Dear Forest Supervisor Melonas,

I believe your current proposed Scoping Document for the Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project is problematic and I think the public needs more time to comment. My concerns with your proposal are:

1. I think an EA is inadequate for a project of this scale and complexity as it impacts many threatened and sensitive species, old growth forests, roadless areas and streams and riparian areas. A more thorough, site-specific analysis of ALL environmental impacts in an Environmental Impact Statement should be done.
2. The FS needs to analyze a full range of alternatives to the agency's proposal, specifically the comprehensive Santa Fe Conservation Alternative submitted by WildEarth Guardians and others.
3. The FS should be identifying and implementing the minimum road system on a landscape scale and come up with a well balanced and 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. The landscape needs to remain as wild as possible as the forests need to be protected so they can remain as resilient as possible in this time of drastic climate chaos.
4. It is frustrating that the FS is not considering the best available science and is instead cherry-picking the science and data to support its proposal while ignoring contrary, credible views and data that deserve to be considered. So if the FS prefers to make this proposal based on its own political agenda, then why even open it up for public comment?
5. Climate chaos is intensifying the negative impacts associated with tree thinning, prescribed burning, and roads. The FS needs to take into account 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 FS should analyze the cumulative impacts of the proposed project with all other past, present and foreseeable future projects within the broader landscape, which include the Hyde Park and Pacheco Canyon projects, livestock grazing, and motorized use.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gayle Janzen  
11232 Dayton Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98133

cgjanzen@comcast.net