

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 7/8/2019 7:29:35 AM

First name: Sirivaishnov

Last name: Gaia-Khan

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

Here are the reasons why we are opposed to the Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resilience Project:

Point #1: Mitigating climate change is now humanity's highest priority. Our big problem is high carbon levels in the atmosphere, primarily human-caused, that are driving up global temperatures. The needed response is to keep carbon where it is, in the carbon sinks we presently have - forests, trees, grasses etc.; and not to continue releasing it in the atmosphere.

Point #2: The US Forest Service and the Greater Santa Fe Fireshed Coalition are now close to implementing the 50,556 acre Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resilience Project. Up to 21,000 acres are to be 'thinned' (the Forest Service's favorite term); but which in reality end up being pretty close to clear cut. Come with us to visit a 'thinned' area to witness the destruction for yourself. A 1-hour-up, 1-hour-down, medium-strenuous hike through an old growth forest starts at the top of the Black Canyon Campground, just a few minutes from downtown Santa Fe on the ski basin road. Hiking up to the ridge top, and looking into the Santa Fe watershed, will show you the sad state of a 'treated' or 'fire-adapted' forest. Typical thinning prescriptions can call for removal of up to 90% of the trees and vegetation.

Point #3: Up to 43,000 acres of the Project Area will be subjected to a landscape-level program of 'prescribed burns'. Dr. Chad Hansen ([https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/219122\\_1da801668a894c9db9f827d9f86f953b.pdf](https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/219122_1da801668a894c9db9f827d9f86f953b.pdf)) writes: "Contrary to popular assumption, high-intensity fire patches produce relatively lower particulate smoke emissions, due to high efficiency of flaming combustion, while low intensity prescribed fires produce high particulate smoke emissions, due to the inefficiency of smoldering combustion.

Therefore, even though high-intensity fire patches consume about three times more biomass per acre than low-intensity fire (Campbell et al. 2007), low-intensity fires produce 3-4 times more particulate smoke than high-intensity fire, for an equal tonnage of biomass consumed (Ward and Hardy 1991, Reid et al. 2005). As a result, a landscape-level program of prescribed burning would cause at least a ten-fold increase in smoke emissions relative to current fire levels, and it would not stop wildland fires when they occur (Stephens et al. 2009)."

Given our rapidly mushrooming climate crisis, the Forest Service and the Fireshed Coalition are willing to do exactly what we should not be doing! The priorities of climate mitigation now trump those of wildfire mitigation.

Point #4: A 'prescribed burn' (a euphemism for burning cut trees, duff and underbrush) is commonly ignited from the air by helicopter. They drop ping-pong-ball-sized containers filled with potassium permanganate crystals (a known toxicant causing respiratory distress in many Santa Fe residents - both human and animal), and ignited with ethylene glycol (antifreeze). Diesel fuel, aluminum gelled gasoline is used with a firing wand to further accelerate the ignition. During the burn, the remaining traumatized trees are often scorched 'accidentally', potentially raising the percentage of trees killed to above 90%. Often, the wood is not harvested, or used in any way, but wastefully incinerated.

Point #5: The goal of Coalition is to implement these radical clearing projects in an effort to stop high-intensity wildfires, like the big fires in California and the Jemez in years past. Their stated intention is to reintroduce repeated low-intensity fires into the landscape, which they think will restore the forest to an idealized version of what it supposedly was 100 years ago, before aggressive suppression of all wildfires became policy on public lands. However, the forests we have today are not the forests of 100 years ago. And today's climate conditions are nowhere close to those of 100 years ago!

Point #6: The Resilience Project is intended to protect lives, homes, and property - even though much of the 'thinning' will be done far away from any human structures, but will negatively impact many wild animal 'structures' and habitat. The Project will result in the destruction of animal and insect habitat. It disrespects the rights of nature, ignores the health of Santa Fe's economy and tourism, and frankly is an affront to the very soul and reason we

live here.

Point #7: The Project also flies in the face of much current fire science, which the Forest Service is choosing to ignore. The new science argues that protecting homes is the best way to insure human safety, NOT the obscene destruction of whole forests that we need more than ever for carbon sequestration, moderating rainfall and ambient temperatures. The latest research suggests that the determining factor of wildfire intensity is less the density of vegetation, as the Forest Service and its Coalition argue, and more the extremity of weather conditions at the time of the fire - which takes us right back to climate change.

Point #8: Trump signed Executive Order 13855 in December of 2018, which was clearly written by lobbyists from the major extractive industries. It orders the Forest Service and the contractors they hire to remove an additional 4.4 billion board feet of lumber from federal public lands. Our forests are commodities to be 'managed'. They have dollarable value, rather than inherent rights. The trees they choose to 'manage' are the valuable mixed conifers (Ponderosa Pine, Douglas Fir, etc.). Other varieties, such as Piñon and Juniper, are considered to be worthless 'weeds'. Many of these clearing and burning 'prescriptions' have already been implemented in Hyde Park, in Pacheco Canyon and La Cueva, and on Rowe Mesa.

In conclusion: This project is irresponsible and outright harmful to all human, tree and animal LIFE!!! Please wake up! This is NOT a time to burn our forests! We must use science and everything we can to protect our forests. DO NOT GO THROUGH WITH THIS> IT IS A VERY BIG MISTAKE.