

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/26/2021 6:41:20 PM

First name: Lucy

Last name: Smith

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing to express my dismay at the SF Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project. I think all this thinning and burning would be a terrible mistake. We need to keep carbon in the trees and ground, not release it as smoke that is a health concern for all. I understand the goal is to prevent mega fires but it doesn't improve the condition of forest vegetation to remove all the shrubs and trees less than 16 inches- How can that be good for wildlife? There will be nothing for them to eat, no shelter or hiding spots. We would be lucky to get any of that to regrow, given the drought and higher temperatures, and then you would burn it all over again in 5-10 years? That is not good for animals. It is not an aesthetic forest either but a heavily managed area. It sounds like fuel reduction doesn't necessarily reduce the speed of a fire on the ground either.

It seems you are destroying the forest to keep a big fire from destroying the forest! Yes, I have seen there are lots of dead trees in the Pecos but I don't think they should be burned and release all that smoke. This plan might have been useful in the PNW where the forests grow so much faster but here in our area I think things will not bounce back. I'd rather take my chances with a natural fire that may or may not occur in any given year, rather than burn so much and pollute the air repeatedly. It sounds like the SF Conservation Alternative would be a more prudent plan. A comprehensive EIA would definitely be advisable under the circumstances with attention to the impacts of our current drought.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments.