

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

First name: Deb

Last name: Dee

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

Dear Ms. Hannah Bergmann,

i am writing out of concern for the Santa Fe National

Forest.

We definitely don't have the studies to support prescribed burns in this area right now, and

I am also calling for an Environmental impact Statement that is important but at best a

stopgap measure . We need to be there live and in person.

simply burning the forest , whether from "prescribed burns" or wildfires that began as

"prescribed burns, such as Cerro Grande, pour large quantities of such chemicals as cyanide into water runoff after a fire. This will definitely exacerbate drought conditions and seriously decrease air

quality for all of us. And what kind of cruel bozo destroys the forest in this manner when birds are

nesting, other animals raising young on the ground and we already face drought conditions here on

the edge off the desert. The trees themselves attract rain to the area.

<https://forestsnews.cifor.org/10316/make-it-rain-planting-forests-to-help-drought-stricken-regions?fnl=en>

We are looking squarely at a Trump plan and so many of his plans are monstrously destructive

because he is insane. Look firefighters- this is a grave horror. Dont burn the forests on our

mountains, especially in the spring and summer. It really does not help.

Here are the results of a new study indicating something I have long known. Trees attract

Rainfall. WE NEED RAINFALL! <http://www.agrometeorology.org/topics/agromet-marketplace/how-forests-attract-rain-a-new-hypothesis>

"Does increased forest protection correspond to higher fire severity in frequent-fire forests

of the western United States?" Bradley, Hanson and DellaSala 2016

This large-scale study concludes that Western frequent-fire forests, including Southwestern

forests, with the highest levels of protection from logging tend to burn least severely[mdash]

logging defined to include the removal of trees, including small trees for non-commercial

fuel reduction.

[://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/.../full;jsessionid...\[hellip\]](://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/.../full;jsessionid...[hellip])

[mdash]"Evaluating spatiotemporal tradeoffs under alternative fuel management and suppression

policies: measuring returns on investment" USFS Thompson, Riley, Loeffler and Hass.

2016

Modeling results in this study confirmed that fire-fuel treatment encounters are rare, such that median fire suppression cost savings resulting from fuel treatments are zero. Sierra National Forest was used as study site to reflect a microcosm of many of the challenges surrounding contemporary fire and fuels management in the western U.S.

https://www.firescience.gov/.../13-1-03-12_final_report.pdf

I see so many people who are on oxygen and breathing machines up here. This is another reason this is a very bad idea, these so-called "prescribed burns" . They seem to be prescribed by people with an unsound foundation in understanding of our living and interconnected ecosystem.

Removing trees 24" in diameter at waist height. That is utter bullshit! It's a gigantic rape of the land, the forest and the residents of Santa Fe who will be breathing this smoke, and if you think that clouds of poisonous smoke at 7,000 feet plus is good for tourism[hellip]or anyone who actually breathes, THINK AGAIN! Please, please think. Do the right thing. Just say no to Prescribed burns in the fragile Santa Fe National Forest. It's really the wrong place for them in this fragile, windy desert ecosystem You are the Forestry SERVICE- Not the forest destroyers. We have not forgotten Cerro Grande. We advise a more cautionary approach. Please at LEAST arrange for an Environmental Impact Study to be done, and not just an assessment. We know what happens with "environmental assessments".

From: [Moonbeam Mesa](#)
To: [Bergemann, Hannah - FS](#)
Subject: Fwd: Prescribed burns affecting the Santa Fe National Forest
Date: Wednesday, June 12, 2019 10:18:28 PM

From: Moonbeam Mesa <moonbeam4273@icloud.com>
Subject: Prescribed burns affecting the Santa Fe National Forest
Date: June 12, 2019 at 6:39:57 PM MDT
To: Hannah.Bergemann@usda.gov

Dear Ms. Hannah Bergmann,

My Name is Deb Dee and i am writing out of concern for the Santa Fe National Forest.

We definitely don't have the studies to support prescribed burns in this area right now, and I am also calling for an Environmental impact Statement that is important but at best a stopgap measure . We need to be there live and in person.

simply burning the forest , whether from "prescribed burns" or wildfires that began as "prescribed burns, such as Cerro Grande, pour large quantities of such chemicals as cyanide into water runoff after a fire. This will definitely exacerbate drought conditions and seriously decrease air quality for all of us. And what kind of cruel bozo destroys the forest in this manner when birds are nesting, other animals raising young on the ground and we already face drought conditions here on the edge off the desert. The trees themselves attract rain to the area.

<https://forestsnews.cifor.org/10316/make-it-rain-planting-forests-to-help-drought-stricken-regions?fnl=en>

We are looking squarely at a Trump plan and so many of his plans are monstrously destructive because he is insane. Look firefighters- this is a grave horror. Dont burn the forests on our mountains, especially in the spring and summer. It really does not help.

Here are the results of a new study indicating something I have long known. Trees attract Rainfall. WE NEED RAINFALL! <http://www.agrometeorology.org/topics/agromet-market-place/how-forests-attract-rain-a-new-hypothesis>

“Does increased forest protection correspond to higher fire severity in frequent-fire forests of the western United States?” Bradley, Hanson and DellaSala 2016

This large-scale study concludes that Western frequent-fire forests, including Southwestern forests, with the highest levels of protection from logging tend to burn least severely— logging defined to include the removal of trees, including small trees for non-commercial fuel reduction.

<://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/.../full;jsessionid.....>

—“Evaluating spatiotemporal tradeoffs under alternative fuel management and suppression policies: measuring returns on investment” USFS Thompson, Riley, Loeffler and Hass. 2016

Modeling results in this study confirmed that fire-fuel treatment encounters are rare, such that median fire suppression cost savings resulting from fuel treatments are zero. Sierra National Forest was used as study site to reflect a microcosm of many of the challenges surrounding contemporary fire and fuels management in the western U.S.

https://www.firescience.gov/.../13-1-03-12_final_report.pdf

I see so many people who are on oxygen and breathing machines up here. This is another reason this is a very bad idea, these so-called "prescribed burns" . They seem to be prescribed by people with an unsound foundation in understanding of our living and

interconnected ecosystem.

Removing trees 24" in diameter at waist height. That is utter bullshit! It's a gigantic rape of the land, the forest and the residents of Santa Fe who will be breathing this smoke, and if you think that clouds of poisonous smoke at 7,000 feet plus is good for tourism...or anyone who actually breathes, THINK AGAIN! Please, please think. Do the right thing. Just say no to Prescribed burns in the fragile Santa Fe National Forest. It's really the wrong place for them in this fragile, windy desert ecosystem You are the Forestry SERVICE- Not the forest destroyers. We have not forgotten Cerro Grande. We advise a more cautionary approach. Please at LEAST arrange for an Environmental Impact Study to be done, and not just an assessment. We know what happens with "environmental assessments".

Sincerely,

Deb Dee ,

3A Las Lomas

Santa Fe, NM, 87508