

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 6/25/2019 4:54:54 PM
First name: Maj-Britt
Last name: Eagle
Organization:
Title:
Comments:
Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project

Jun 25, 2019

Forest Supervisor James Melonas

Dear Forest Supervisor Melonas,

Dear Mr. Melonas,

Last night's presentation indicated a sincere belief in the need to clear and burn an enormous chunk of our forest, "for our own good"; between the two, clearing and then burning, it is the fire to stop fires that most jars in this time of climate crisis when sequestering, not emitting carbon, is our ultimate value for the planet's biosphere to survive. Wild Earth Guardian has an alternative: may you read and consider with heart/mind!

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 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,

Maj-Britt Eagle
21 Cougar Rdg
Santa Fe, NM 87505-8196
mbeagle@redshift.com

June 29, 2019
21 Cougar Ridge Rd.
Santa Fe 87505

Dear Mr. Melonas, and to his excellent staff, Genaro, Denis, Heidi, Hannah, Sandy, and others,

I write in appreciation for the two presentations, their quality of being well prepared, and the sincerity of those who represented your department.

We too share the USDA Forest Service's appreciation of risk, but the risk is to the Earth's biosphere, to the species inherently valuable to its interdependent web. The Earth's life support system is primary, human well-being derivative. Sustaining habitats, supporting the community of trees ~ much of which lies beneath the soil in mycellium and mychorrizal networking ~ enables the forest ecology to survive, and consequently, carbon to stay in the ground. Human initiated fires in this time of unpredictably strong and erratic gusts of wind may slip from your control, release carbon, destroy the soil, and create conditions for flooding when the monsoons come.

Let's respect a compromise: thin only 50% of our forest, discriminately, so as to save endangered species such as the Southwestern white pine whose resilient examples are unique to our forests, the others having succumbed to rust. Protect wildlife habitats, for example the endangered Albert's squirrel with its pricked up pointy ears, or the spotted owl. Track the number of indicator species, such as the woodpecker, before you take down the aspens that serve for so many as homes. In sum, guarantee to us and to the Earth's ecosystems an Environmental Impact Statement before you proceed. How else can we believe in your commitment to a resilient forest in times of climate change?

Fire begun by man, dropped on the stacked piles of slash, releases chemicals, toxins, and heavy metals. Since your project promises to repeat these fires during the burning and clearing over this time and again every seven to ten years, we wonder why we moved from smoky California to the 8,000 feet Sangria de Cristo mountains! Gone will be the delineated landscapes, the fresh air to breathe, the amazing deep blue of the New Mexican skies.

Jobs for the Forest Service lie in protecting the forest's ecosystem, for a tree needs its community (Peter Wohlleben, the Hidden Life of Trees). Build zuni bowls to retain rainfall, collect the Ponderosa pinecones (so healthy and vigorous where we walk, in the logging trails up Forest Road 79) so to conserve the power to regenerate the pines, plant native and streamside vegetation to slow flood waters, to sequester carbon.

Put the Earth's well-being (for intense fires can promote life) before your own. We humans are but equal partners in this complex, self-adapting, self-organizing network that supports all life, human and nonhuman.

Respectfully, Maj-Britt Eagle 21 Cougar Ridge Road, Santa Fe 87505

M. Eagle 29 June 2019

Santa Fe Mountain Landscape Resiliency Project

The Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency (SFMLR) Project is a vegetation management project spanning approximately 50,566 acres proposed by the Española and Pecos-Las Vegas Ranger Districts. The purpose of the Project is to improve the ecosystem resilience of a priority landscape to future disturbances including wildfire, climate change, and insect outbreaks.

The SFMLR project is an activity implementing a land management plan and not authorized under the HFRA and is subject to 36 CFR 218 Subparts A and B.

Only individuals or entities (as defined by 36 CFR 218.2) who submit timely and specific written comments (as defined by 36 CFR 218.2) about this proposed project or activity during this or another public comment period established by the Responsible Official will be eligible to file an objection. Other requirements to be eligible to submit an objection are defined by 36 CFR 218.25 (a)(3) and include name, postal address, title of the project and signature or other verification of identity upon request and the identity of the individual or entity who authored the comments. Individual members of an entity must submit their own individual comments in order to have eligibility to object as an individual. A timely submission will be determined as outlined in 36 CFR 218.25 (a)(4). It is the responsibility of the sender to ensure timely receipt of any comments submitted. Names and contact information submitted with comments will become part of the public record and may be released under the Freedom of Information Act.

Specific written comments should be within the scope of the proposed action, have a direct relationship to the proposed action, and must include supporting reasons for the Responsible Official to consider (36 CFR 218.2).

This is an opportunity for you to provide your interests, concerns, and recommendations for the SFMLR Project area. You may be assisted by a facilitator and/or note taker. This form may serve as your submission of comments for the Scoping period.

How do we contact you?

Please provide your specific comments below.

21 Cougar Rd, Santa Fe 87505
Maj Britt Eagle

June 24, 2019

To the Forest and Freshed Coalition,
From the Nation Magazine, the Christian Science Monitor, YES!, we hear that carbon "farming", "ranching", "gardening" can reduce emissions, restore ecological balance, and offer hope to the rising generation; i.e., regenerative practices in our forests will remove the carbon that fuels

Climate disturbance when it is in our atmosphere.



please see p.2

As home owners adjacent to the Santa Fe Forest, Forest Rd 79, we question the unprecedented scale of this project, its reluctance to reveal specific details, and seeming lack of deep environmental analysis. For example, necessarily road/machines will intrude into wildlife habitat; this effects a loss of wildlife security, especially if, as I understand, the clearing of the forest and ensuing burn of slash (piled high - why? for fire intensity?), will happen at intervals (every 10 years). Reminder that Aldo Leopold highlights the value of every member of our ecosystem, whether or not we understand each one's function.

"In wilderness lies the salvation of the world", (Thoreau), and this project's impact to our wilderness (roadless areas have great value!) will lessen the economic value of our home, and most certainly our joy in inhabiting our forest.

You state in your letter to the public that this project will improve the forest's resilience to insects, disease, and climate change, yet the opposite seems the case: a tree is not a forest. On its own a tree cannot establish a consistent local climate. It is at the mercy of wind and weather. But together, many trees create an ecosystem that moderates extremes of heat and cold, stores a great deal of water, and generates a great deal of humidity — to get to this point the community of trees must remain intact, no matter what. Every tree is valuable - in part by virtue of the "smart" ecology of communication beneath the soil. (Peter Wohlleben, Hidden Life of Forests)

Beauty is inherent to our realizing a healthy, resilient forest; have you a landscape architect to design and oversee the cut and burn? Fire, in effect, alarms: when you burn the slash, toxins + chemicals will be released, their embers carried by the wind to the watershed. Particulates will be inhaled by our residents, wildlife and humans - to the detriment of health of all. Such burning and clearing when monsoons happen erodes the soil - so that said "regeneration"

can not occur, perhaps ever again.

Maj-Britt Eagle 24 June '19

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 8/5/2019 12:00:00 AM

First name: Maj-Britt

Last name: Eagle

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

Dear Mr. Melonas, and to his excellent staff, Genaro, Denis, Heidi, Hannah, Sandy, and others, I write in appreciation for the two presentations, their quality of being well prepared, and the sincerity of those who represented your department.

We too share the USDA Forest Service's appreciation of risk, but the risk is to the Earth's biosphere, to the species inherently valuable to its interdependent web. The Earth's life support system is primary, human well-being derivative. Sustaining habitats, supporting the community of trees ~ much of which lies beneath the soil in mycellium and mychorrizal networking~ enables the forest ecology to survive, and consequently, carbon to stay in the ground. Human initiated fires in this time of unpredictably strong and erratic gusts of wind may slip from your control, release carbon, destroy the soil, and create conditions for flooding when the monsoons come.

Let's respect a compromise: thin only 50% of our forest, discriminately, so as to save endangered species such as the Southwestern white pine whose resilient examples are unique to our forests, the others having succumbed to rust. Protect wildlife habitats, for example the endangered Albert's squirrel with its pricked up pointy ears, or the spotted owl. Track the number of indicator species, such as the woodpecker, before you take down the aspens that serve for so many as homes. In sum, guarantee to us and to the Earth's ecosystems an Environmental Impact Statement before you proceed. How else can we believe in your commitment to a resilient forest in times of climate change?

Fire begun by man, dropped on the stacked piles of slash, releases chemicals, toxins, and heavy metals. Since your project promises to repeat these fires during the burning and clearing over this time and again every seven to ten years, we wonder why we moved from smoky California to the 8,000 feet Sangria de Cristo mountains! Gone will be the delineated landscapes, the fresh air to breathe, the amazing deep blue of the New Mexican skies.

Jobs for the Forest Service lie in protecting the forest's ecosystem, for a tree needs its community (Peter Wohlleben, the Hidden Life of Trees). Build zuni bowls to retain rainfall, collect the Ponderosa pinecones (so healthy and vigorous where we walk, in the logging trails up Forest Road 79) so to conserve the power to regenerate the pines, plant native and streamside vegetation to slow flood waters, to sequester carbon. Put the Earth's well-being (for intense fires can promote life) before your own. We humans are but equal partners in this complex, self-adapting, self-organizing network that supports all life, human and nonhuman.

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 8/5/2019 12:00:00 AM

First name: Maj-Britt

Last name: Eagle

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

To the Forest and Fireshed Coalition,

From the Nation Magazine, the Christian Science Monitor, YES!, we hear that carbon "farming", "ranching", "gardening" can reduce emissions restore ecological balance, and offer hope to the rising generation; i.e, regenerative practices in our forests will remove the carbon that fuels climate disturbance when it is in our atmosphere.

As homeowners adjacent to the Santa Fe Forest, Forest Rd 79, we question the unprecedented scale of this project, its reluctance to reveal specific details, and seeming lack of deep environmental analysis. For example, necessarily road/machines will intrude into wildlife habitat; this effects a loss of wildlife security, especially if, as I understand, the clearing of the forest and ensuing burn of slash (piled high -- why? for fire intensity), will happen at intervals (every 10 years). Reminder that Aldo Leopold highlights the value of every member of our ecosystem, whether or not we understand each one's function.

"In wilderness lies salvation of the world," (Thoreau), and this project's impacts to our wilderness (roadless areas have great value!) will lessen the economic value of our home, and most certainly our joy of inhabiting our forest.

You state in your letter to the public that this project will improve the forest's resilience to insects, disease, and climate change, yet the opposite seems the case: a tree is not a forest. On its own a tree cannot establish a consistent local climate. It is at the mercy of the wind and weather. But together, many trees create an ecosystem that moderates extremes of heat and cold, stores a great deal of water, and generates a great deal of humidity -- to get to this point the community of trees must remain intact, no matter what. Every tree is valuable -- in part by virtue of the "smart" ecology of communication beneath the soil. (Peter Wohleben, Hidden Life of Forests)

Beauty is inherent to our realizing a healthy, resilient forest: have you a landscape architect to design and oversee the cut and burn? Fire, in effect alarms: when you burn the slash, toxins and chemicals will be released, their embers carried by the wind to the watershed. Particulates will be inhaled by our residents, wildlife and human -- to be the detriment of health of all. Such burning and clearing when monsoons happen erodes the soil -- so that said "regeneration" can not occur, perhaps ever again.

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 6/25/2019 4:54:54 PM
First name: Maj-Britt
Last name: Eagle
Organization:
Title:
Comments:
Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project

Jun 25, 2019

Forest Supervisor James Melonas

Dear Forest Supervisor Melonas,

Dear Mr. Melonas,

Last night's presentation indicated a sincere belief in the need to clear and burn an enormous chunk of our forest, "for our own good"; between the two, clearing and then burning, it is the fire to stop fires that most jars in this time of climate crisis when sequestering, not emitting carbon, is our ultimate value for the planet's biosphere to survive. Wild Earth Guardian has an alternative: may you read and consider with heart/mind!

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 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,

Maj-Britt Eagle
21 Cougar Rdg
Santa Fe, NM 87505-8196
mbeagle@redshift.com

