

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/29/2021 6:51:33 PM

First name: Gary

Last name: Sharlow

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Santa Fe Mountains Landscape Resiliency Project

I feel very strongly that a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement must be completed for this project. I am in support of managing the forest however I am concerned about the unintended consequences on human health, animal health, and the forest ecology due to the use of herbicides and fire retardants. I live on the very edge of the forest and am worried about what impact this will have on my health and the health of my family. There is no analysis of the health effects of the increased amount of smoke the public will breathe due to prescribed burning.

I would like to see Site-specific information for this project and not the current conditions-based approach. I feel strongly that the best available science must be incorporated in the planning and analysis of this project and do not believe that this has been done to this point. An EIS is required when a project has significant impacts on the human environment that is controversial, and when a project damages forest resources. This project will have significant impacts on human health, it is controversial and the forest will undoubtedly be damaged by these fires. Thinning from approximately 500 trees per acre down to 2-50 trees per acre is approaching a clearcut. It leaves the forest too dry and open, can cause leave trees to blow over, and allows the wind to whip between trees, fanning up flames in a wildfire.

The parameters for treatments are so generalized that we know neither where the treatments will occur nor how they will be carried out in a site-specific way. I do not approve of these generalizations. I want clear burn plans and am not okay with this statement: " "The actual location of forest treatments would occur where deemed appropriate at the time of implementation."

The Forest Service did not allow the public to view any of the over 5,000 public scoping comments online or even in person at Santa Fe National Forest headquarters. Forest Service personnel on multiple occasions stated in the media they would only be thinning small trees when in reality the draft environmental assessment states that larger-sized trees will be thinned. Which is it? We need more trees, not fewer, for carbon sequestration and to hold moisture into the forest. Forests that are thinned and/or logged tend to burn more often and at a higher intensity, not at a lower intensity. I would like to see further analysis on the impacts of thinning and prescribed burning on Mexican spotted owls. The analysis of this in the environmental assessment is inadequate.