
BLM Poses Significant Threat to Rural Life in Placitas

(Quiet, rural, clean air, water, property values, open spaces and wildlife)

The Placitas BLM lands consisting of 3143 acres to the north, 917 acres to the east (Crest of Montezuma) and 200 acres by Overlook, are up for sale/transfer, development, mining, gas and oil dev., highways, and energy corridors, as part of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Resource Management Plan (RMP) update. Public comments are due on the DRAFT Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) by 10/11/12.

http://www.blm.gov/nm/st/en/fo/Rio_Puerco_Field_Office/rpfo_planning/rpfo_draft_rmp.html

WHOA Endorses the Pueblo of San Felipe WILD HORSE Observers Association

Some of you have read that Santa Ana Pueblo is requesting support for acquisition of the BLM to the north of Placitas. What you may not know is that San Felipe Pueblo has long been working to reacquire these same BLM lands as their ancestral lands. Unlike Santa Ana Pueblo, the Pueblo of San Felipe has detailed covenants on how they will conserve the land, protect wildlife and wild horses, and allow public access. On this basis, WHOA endorses San Felipe Pueblo.

The Pueblo of San Felipe has a conservation track record with their previous acquisition of the Ball Ranch. They have also purchased private lands on the east end of Placitas in a meaningful way to block any highway from I-25 to Highway 14 which would damage the wildlife corridor. WHOA and The Pueblo of San Felipe have come together over wildlife and habitat conservation.

San Felipe will capably and humanely handle wild horse population control. They have had pueblo members trained in the use of immuno-contraception because it is effective and safe, for the land and other wildlife. The San Felipe acquisition will enable the horses to disperse over a wider area as the San Felipe Pueblo lands are contiguous with the North Placitas BLM lands.

WHOA cannot endorse The Pueblo of Santa Ana, though we have worked on fencing with them for 6 years and their Hyatt has a program for "BLM" wild horses. Sadly, Santa Ana is setting the Placitas Wild Horses up for slaughter, designating them as "livestock", and refusing discussion.

Pathways: Wildlife Corridors of NM Supports San Felipe

Pueblo to acquire Parcel A, section 13 & 18, of BLM land north of Placitas. The Pueblo has management objectives in line with what Pathways would want for this land, which is to leave them as is, no mining, no highways, and no suburban development. The Pueblo of San Felipe has demonstrated this non-commercial use of the land in past acquisitions of BLM land (2001). Most importantly, the Land Management committee of the Pueblo has met with us to answer questions, and is available to meet with us in the future to address our comments and concerns about this possible land acquisition. We can therefore, in good faith, support their bid to restore this public land to Pueblo ownership.

Peter Callen, Pathways - Wildlife Corridors of NM <http://pathwayswc.wordpress.com/>

Wildlife Corridor - San Felipe Corridor to Jemez Mts. Four *Bridges* Under I-25 Constructed

The Pueblo of San Felipe has had four bridges (versus only culverts) built under I-25 to enable wildlife to move from the Sandias under I-25 to the Rio Grande River and Jemez Mts. Both wild horses and elk utilize these. San Felipe Pueblo also does not fence the wild horses from the river, as horses do not lounge at rivers. In contrast, the corridor under I-25 to Santa Ana at Las Huertas Creek is not a bridge, it is only culverts which much wildlife will not pass through.

Please join WHOA and Pathways in their endorsement of the San Felipe Pueblo to re-acquire their ancestral lands for the preservation of the open spaces, wildlife corridor, and all the wildlife which GRACE it.

Contributions to WHOA – PO Box 932, Placitas, NM 87043, Walk in deposits at the US Bank in Placitas, or PayPal online at whoanm.org

Contributions to Pathways, P.O. Box 305, Placitas, NM 87043 OR through PayPal: pathwayswc.wordpress.com

Very Special Thanks to: Renee B. Lameka Estate and to: Kevin Quail of Placitas

PUBLIC COMMENT FORM: Please initial or check ALL the comments below that you agree with. Add your personal comments below and send them to the BLM in the addressed envelope provided.

Dear BLM Administrator,

RE: Rio Puerco DEIS

_____ I would like the BLM to allow the San Felipe pueblo to reacquire the Placitas BLM lands as they did in the "Phase I" http://www.lasplacitas.org/rio_puerco/data/San_Felipe_Land_Exchange_2001/SanFelipe_feis.pdf, the previous (Ball Ranch) land transfer. This one-time transfer to the Pueblo of San Felipe would end all future destruction of the wild life corridor, and inhumane treatment of the free roaming horses. This transfer of ownership would also end the possibility of future land development and gravel mining (with its inherent noise/air/water quality degradation).

_____ I am concerned about wildlife corridors, the BLM should provide for the continuance of wildlife corridors in and around Sandia Mtn.

_____ I am concerned that gravel mining leases should only be given to companies with proven environmental records free from fines and free from histories of previous environmental endangerment.

_____ Right of Ways (ROWs) in Unit #5 BLM areas in Placitas need to be addressed in the DEIS/RMP. Roads and transmission lines need to be studied publicly or excluded from the Unit #5 BLM area in Placitas.

_____ County road repair, health hazards, water consumption, noise, and loss of real estate taxes in Sandoval County, surrounding pueblos and residential communities, need to be studied in detail in this plan.

_____ Existing, unfinished reclamation of mining sites needs to be addressed in this DEIS/RMP. Acres of barren land from abandon mining sites are visible from miles away. It has not been restored to its pre-mining state. Proposing more mining in and around Placitas, a residential area, is unacceptable until this is addressed.

_____ The free roaming horses cannot be addressed without historical research, study, and inventory. They were deemed out of scope in the Scoping Process. The scoping process needs to be revisited for the horses in order for them to adequately addressed in the rest of this public RMP process.

_____ Proposing additional gravel mining but not addressing traffic and the roads needed to move the gravel from the mines to local roads is unacceptable. Traffic studies need to be conducted before any proposed increased levels of mining is allowed.

Name _____ Address _____

Signature _____