Subject: emc-0073

emc-0073
----- Forwarded by Brian Amme/NVSO/NV/BLM/DOI on 01/03/2006 01:54 PM -----

nettyaks@aol.com

12/29/2005 03:00 PM

To
vegeis@nv.blm.gov

cc
nettyaks@aol.com,
invasive@pesticide.org,
ALANHIGSPOTTERY@aol.com

Subject
Don't Spray: short term solution to Invasive Plants!

Dear BLM,

This letter is in response to the current proposal to greatly increase your reliance on the use of chemical sprays to try and reign in the invasive plant problem on BLM lands. As both a botanist and a cancer survivor, I have several comments on this plan. First, seeing the development of this noxious plants problem over the past 3 decades in forests of Oregon, Washington and California where I have done most of my work (and recreation), this is a complex problem. It is brought on by many sources, forest harvests, recreationalists and the general mixing of the forest to urban interface. It cannot be solved by entering into the short term and toxic solution of herbicide use. As a botanist who has worked and also volunteered in noxious weed removal programs, I can testify that plants that spread by multi-mechanisms (wind, seed, water, rhizomonously, and by animal/human attachment)will not be stopped, or even slowed by chemical means, except for the very short term. And, at what costs? This brings me to my second point, which is, why in heavens would we risk contamination of our water sources, fish-bearing streams, sensitive species habitat or even human health to embark on a program that will only require repeated toxic applications? As a Non-Hodgkins lymphoma survivor, whose cancer is often directly linked to 2,4-D and other herbicide exposures, worry isn't a strong enough word to describe my grounds for opposing widespread aerial or other spray programs as the solution for invasive plant control.

Please drop these type of plans and seek other combinations of work towards finding a solution for this complex problem.

Thank you. Sincerely,

Annette Simonson
1240 NW Shady Lane

Albany, OR 97321