

January 15, 2016

To: USDA Forest Service
Re: Rulemaking for Colorado Roadless Areas SDEIS

I oppose the Forest Service proposal to reopen the coal mining exception in the Colorado Roadless Rule. I therefore support Alternative A—No Action.

We are entering a new era. Observe that in the deficiencies challenged in the District Court in the initial Exception to the Colorado Roadless Rule focused on lack of attention to Climate Change. I believe every country on the Planet is concerned about Climate Change. So after 40 years of warning in this country, some of our agencies are starting to take heed. In this Draft I applaud the lengths you went to to analyze global climate change and the associated social costs of carbon from the production, transportation and burning of coal from this Exception. In this Era hopefully this will be the measure to which our public agencies must strive.

We are in the Era now where every ton of emissions into our atmosphere counts. The potential to add 130 million tons of carbon dioxide pollution into the atmosphere and cause as much as \$13 billion in damage to the world's economy and environment makes the climate costs of this proposal too high.

Continuing to open Colorado Roadless lands to more coal mining, will weaken the intent of the Clean Power Plan, acting to delay the implementation of alternative renewable energy in our states. And shipping our carbon across oceans has no value in creating “energy security” for our nation as outlined in your agency's 2011 Strategic Energy Framework. The availability of our coal to other nations in the same way delays other nations shift to Clean Energy. In this view, I do not believe we are supporting our Planet or any nation on it. President Obama and climate scientists agree that if we want to halt the worst potential damage from climate change, we must keep some of the world's known fossil fuel reserves in the ground.

From the Conclusions of your Cumulative Effects including Climate Change, Increasing Human Population Growth and Development, Increasing Recreation Demand and Increasing Energy Demand, it is apparent that these increasing pressures on our Public Lands mean that we need to take every possible precaution to conserve what exists of our natural environment. Therefore I feel that the conclusion to reinstate the Exception is not in line with the proposal to reinstate the Exception .

With the mission to “sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the nation’s forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations”, I do not believe this Exception measures up to that mission.

Again I appreciate the amount of work and thinking that went into your SDEIS. I thank you for all efforts to support this nation and the world in weathering the current life threatening crises we have created on our Planet.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Swackhamer 970.527.4034
PO Box 1291
Paonia, CO 81428