

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 8/7/2019 12:00:00 AM

First name: Patricia

Last name: Stewart

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

Mr Melonas,

I am disappointed and saddened with what has transpired between the public and the Forest Service. The public

meetings were designed to limit public comment, keep comments superficial, and allow the Forest Service to dominate

the time frame allowed for the meetings. Many of us did not get heard, nor were all questions answered adequately.

I realize that science is next to God for most people, but the Heart has been left out of this equation. Trees are beings.

All life is sentient and alive. All have structures, societies, and designs for survival. What makes a human qualified to

determine what is best for Nature? The evidence seems to indicate we don't know at all how to care for this earth. I

believe the less we do, the better off we all are in the long run. I witnessed the clearing done at Black Canyon

Campground in 2002. What I see, 17 years later, looks nothing like resiliency. Not only were the majority of trees

felled, but many of the adults that "survived" have been uprooted by the winds for lack of support from their family of

trees. This is ecocide!

How can I believe in the benevolence of your project after seeing this, and how can I believe your science when you

have not demonstrated you have considered climate change and recent studies on the effectiveness of your thin/burn

paradigm, nor considered alternative treatments?

I DO NOT GIVE MY CONSENT TO THIS PROJECT.

I agree with all the points in the following draft by treehuggersantafe.org :

As a resident of Santa Fe, I am deeply concerned about the enormous size of this project, the short comment period allowed to the public, and the repeated response by the Forest Service employees that there will be no Environmental Impact Statement regarding its effects on our beloved forest. It took longer, with more public input, to approve the small Railyard Project, in comparison to the 50,000 acres in this project.

I would like to know why there is such a rush to push this permanent cutting and burning of our

forests? Please extend the comment period to 90 days for a more democratic process.

The Forest Service is arguing that the entire forest needs to be thinned and burned, but, the research of Dr. Chad Hansen and Dr. Jack Cohen shows that the most effective mitigation of damaged property in the event of wildfire is to directly treat around homes and structures.

This current science must be considered carefully.

I would like for you to allow the climate scientists with experience in forestry, such as Dr. Dominick Della Salla, PhD, to weigh in during this critical time of massive loss of species, habitat, and plants in our local Santa Fe area and throughout the world before settling on the final draft of this plan.

I feel the last thing we need is to cut our carbon sequestering plants. They provide Santa Fe our only buffer against the climate crisis. We truly need every tree we have and every other plant in Santa Fe to help us bring moisture and rain, keep the ground cool as the temperatures rise, and decrease winds and the spread of pests and other parasites on trees that occur with thinning.

I would also like you to consider the health of the wildlife and the public when using aerial ignitions containing potassium permanganate, ethylene glycol and diesel fuel and how these are currently affecting our health and well-being. These harmful chemicals also impact the economy, tourism and reputation of Santa Fe as one of the cleanest cities in the country. Many citizens of Santa Fe are complaining about current fires and the health affects (whereas the equally impacted wildlife cannot).

I am also concerned about opening roads (either lightly loaded or inventoried roadless areas) and increasing the exposure of our wilderness to further exploitation by industry which can degrade wildlife habitat, spread invasive species, and allow arsonist and wildlife poachers free access. Many roads in the forest should be completely obliterated, not improved for access.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my concerns.

From: [Melonas, James -FS](#)
To: [Bergemann, Hannah - FS](#)
Subject: Fwd: Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project
Date: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 6:45:16 PM

James E. Melonas
Forest Supervisor
Forest Service
Santa Fe National Forest

p: 505-438-5312
f: 505-438-5391
james.melonas@usda.gov

11 Forest Ln
Santa Fe, NM 87508
www.fs.fed.us

From: Stewart <patricia.stewart@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 6:43:07 PM
To: Melonas, James -FS
Subject: Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project

This is a resend:

~ Please acknowledge receipt of this letter ~

James Melonas, Forest
Supervisor
National
Forest
Forest
Drive
Santa Fe, NM 87508

Santa Fe

Mr Melonas,

I am disappointed and saddened with what has transpired between the public and the Forest Service. The public meetings were designed to limit public comment, keep comments superficial, and allow the Forest Service to dominate the time frame allowed for the meetings. Many of us did not get heard, nor were all questions answered adequately.

I realize that science is next to God for most people, but the Heart has been left out of this equation. Trees are beings. All life is sentient and alive. All have structures, societies, and designs for survival. What makes a human qualified to determine what is best for Nature? The evidence seems to indicate we don't know at all how to care for this earth. I believe the less we do, the better off we all are in the long run. I witnessed the clearing done at Black Canyon Campground in 2002. What I see, 17 years later, looks nothing like resiliency. Not only were the majority of trees felled, but many of the adults that "survived" have been uprooted by the winds for lack of support from their family of trees. This is ecocide!

How can I believe in the benevolence of your project after seeing this, and how can I believe your science when you have not demonstrated you have considered climate change and recent studies on the effectiveness of your thin/burn paradigm, nor considered alternative treatments?

I DO NOT GIVE MY CONSENT TO THIS PROJECT.

I agree with all the points in the following draft by treehuggersantafe.org :

As a resident of Santa Fe, I am deeply concerned about the enormous size of this project, the short comment period allowed to the public, and the repeated response by the Forest Service employees that there will be no Environmental Impact Statement regarding its effects on our beloved forest. It took longer, with more public input, to approve the small Railyard Project, in comparison to the 50,000 acres in this project.

I would like to know why there is such a rush to push this permanent cutting and burning of our forests? Please extend the comment period to 90 days for a more democratic process.

The Forest Service is arguing that the entire forest needs to be thinned and burned, but, the research of Dr. Chad Hansen and Dr. Jack Cohen shows that the most effective mitigation of damaged property in the event of wildfire is to directly treat around homes and structures. This current science must be considered carefully.

I would like for you to allow the climate scientists with experience in forestry, such as Dr. Dominick Della Salla, PhD, to weigh in during this critical time of massive loss of species, habitat, and plants in our local Santa Fe area and throughout the world before settling on the final draft of this plan.

I feel the last thing we need is to cut our carbon sequestering plants. They provide Santa Fe our only buffer against the climate crisis. We truly need every tree we have and every other plant in Santa Fe to help us bring moisture and rain, keep the ground cool as the temperatures rise, and decrease winds and the spread of pests and other parasites on trees that occur with thinning.

I would also like you to consider the health of the wildlife and the public when using aerial ignitions containing potassium permanganate, ethylene glycol and diesel fuel and how

these are currently affecting our health and well-being. These harmful chemicals also impact the economy, tourism and reputation of Santa Fe as one of the cleanest cities in the country. Many citizens of Santa Fe are complaining about current fires and the health affects (whereas the equally impacted wildlife cannot).

I am also concerned about opening roads (either lightly loaded or inventoried roadless areas) and increasing the exposure of our wilderness to further exploitation by industry which can degrade wildlife habitat, spread invasive species, and allow arsonist and wildlife poachers free access. Many roads in the forest should be completely obliterated, not improved for access. Thank you for your time and consideration of my concerns.

Sincerely,

Patricia Stewart

patricia.stewart@cox.net