Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/14/2018 1:22:47 PM
First name: Roger
Last name: Leuthner
Organization:
Title:
Comments: As an avid skier and outdoor recreational participant, I strenuously OBJECT to this project on several grounds:

1) Scarce drinking water resource diversion to:
2) Benefit a very few: the ski hill landowners and a small minority of skiers that would consider a small patch of man-made snow to be worth skiing down
3) Dubious representation of firefighting utility of the project
4) Taxpayer funding for a private enterprise that should utilize it's own private resources for expansion.
5) Environmental degradation through construction of pipeline and storage facilities; the damage to the little-remaining forest is unacceptable.

The 'public service' justification of this project is given that it will help in local firefighting efforts. This is an unsubstantiated claim, and laughable considering the entire surrounding mountain has already burned off, and it will be decades (probably long after the useful life of this project) before there would be enough reforestation to warrant consideration of any excess fuels.

This "Ski Hill" should remain a resource that is usable should natural conditions support it, otherwise the environmental and economic cost is much too great for too small of a benefit. If it has to close due to a loss of economic viability then that is a risk that the owners undertook when they purchased the area, and it should not be up to taxpayers to help bail them out in their investment. After all, if the ski hill was wildly profitable, would the owners be eager to share their profits with the general public? I think not.

In my opinion this is a wanton diversion of taxpayer resources to benefit a very few, and I also suspect the motivation is rooted in a longer term condo/vacation home development aspiration by the Pajarito Ski Hill owners. Development is not necessarily a bad thing, but in this case diverting taxpayer dollars to springboard such a project is a travesty to our democracy.

Thank you for considering my comments, Roger Leuthner