

Date submitted (Mountain Standard Time): 7/5/2019 2:12:33 PM

First name: Stewart

Last name: Farley

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

Dear Mr. Melonas,

Please consider my comments regarding the Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project. My family frequently uses this forest area for recreation. Please ensure that an Environmental Impact Statement is prepared that cites the negative impacts of extensive burning and clearing over several years. This measure could help ensure that current scientific studies are considered and implemented for the safety of the forest as well as the surrounding communities.

As you know, the Santa Fe National Forest is marred by unlawful roadways already. These old roads should be blocked and not used further by vehicle traffic, including tree clearing equipment. Illegal trapping is already a significant hazard for two and four legged visitors and remedying these improper roadways would help to enhance safety in the area.

The proposed actions in the designated roadless areas will not provide a remedy to the existing safety hazards posed to those who reside near the forest. The proposed plan will merely provide a false sense of security and negate any possible productive proactive measures that the public could take to establish useful fire breaks.

Fires are driven by wind and climate so when droughts occur accompanied by high winds, low humidity, and high temperatures, fire danger increases dramatically and no amount of fuel reduction will change fire behavior, as is seen in the research conducted on fires after they have occurred. When climatic conditions are right, fires will burn through the forests no matter what the fuel load is.

I am especially concerned about the fuel loads immediately adjacent to the Hyde Park subdivision across from Ten Thousand Waves. Another area is around Canada de las Alamos and the Pecos/Glorieta area. Specific attention should be paid to these and other areas where property and lives are at risk.

I am not opposed to thinning, but I feel that the proposed plan is much too radical.

More detail on this plan is needed for meaningful consideration. Please extend the comment period to at least 90 days since 30 days is not sufficient for meaningful public comment.

Sincerely,

Stewart Farley