

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/30/2021 9:32:41 PM

First name: Carol

Last name: Toffaleti

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I urge the Forest Service to conduct an environmental review of the proposed mountain coaster. A mountain coaster is an intense use that could have negative impacts on wildlife in the adjoining Wilderness Area and would harm enjoyment of the Sandia Mountain landscape by other people, e.g. hikers and snowshoers like myself. While I appreciate that this proposal might be less intrusive than several others already built in North America that are only accessed by automobile and have higher and longer tracks, I think that both a broader and more thorough analysis is warranted of the potential impacts of the construction and operation of a year-round coaster on the Sandias, which are such a significant and precious natural area for residents and visitors. A full analysis of different scenarios and their impacts should be made public before this proposal proceeds any further.

The following issues were not adequately addressed in the on-line materials from the Forest Service and Sandia Tram Company in my opinion and, along with others, should be considered in an environmental review:

- 1.What is the estimated and maximum capacity of riders per hour and in different seasons? What proportion is estimated to access the coaster by car (from the Crest, ski area or trailhead parking) rather than by tram? The coaster would increase human activity in the special use area and-significantly-year-round. This increase, along with the associated vehicular traffic and parking demand, should be described in more detail.
- 2.Are any threatened or endangered species present in or near the area of the proposed coaster and do they breed or raise their young there? The National Forest that adjoins the southern edge of the ski area is designated Wilderness Area (though not identified as such on the on-line maps) with special protections for fauna, flora, and human opportunities for solitude. The timing and method of construction and the operation of the coaster should be considered relative to these policies. For example, a ticketing and waiting system should minimize outdoor crowding around the coaster entrance and the trails that lead to it.
- 3.How many and what species and size of trees would be removed to make way for the coaster? Removal, especially of any larger trees, will change the landscape and reduce wildlife habitat and carbon storage, which should be made transparent to the public.
- 4.How close to hiking and cross-country skiing/snowshoeing trails would the coaster be? On-line information says it wouldn't "affect" three trails, apparently because it doesn't actually cross them and the sound it generates is less than 60 decibels (supposedly similar to normal conversation), but people congregating around the entrance, mechanical sounds, and the repeated sight and cries of riders swooshing down the track and then back up slope would certainly disturb the quiet enjoyment of nature and landscape that hikers, snowshoers, etc. typically seek. Environmental review needs to consider the sounds emanating from, and the visibility of, the coaster more broadly, from various trails on the Crest and east slope of the mountain.
- 5.Details about the design of the coaster and the architecture of the associated 800-1000 sf structure are needed in order to understand how they would fit into the landscape and impact views. Muted colors and low reflectivity for the metal infrastructure and coaster cars, for example, would help them blend into the natural landscape.
- 6.Finally, the company material mentions that Chair Lift #1 is slated for removal, without specifying a timeline. If the coaster proposal proceeds, removal of the lift and revegetation of the slope should be included as a condition of approval in order to reduce structural clutter in the special use ski area.

Thank you for considering these comments.