Subject: Comment on BLM Programmatic EIS for pesticide Vegetation Treatments in 17 Western States

Brian Amme, Project Manager
BLM, P.O. Box 12000
Reno, NV 89520-0006

See FL-0001

Mr. Brian Amme,

I read the Bureau of Land Management's proposal for pesticide applications to public lands in western states. I am urging BLM to choose Option 3 (C) in its proposal, wherein alternative control methods, other than pesticides, would be used. As someone who uses, enjoys, and—as a citizen--OWNER of these public lands, I am deeply concerned with allowing such a large use of pesticides on public lands, including National Monuments and National Conservation areas.

An integral part of this proposal involves aerial spraying of toxic pesticides, which increases negative impacts on non-targeted vegetation, wildlife, and people, including recreationists, tourists, and native peoples (pesticide application areas include Alaska, where native fishing and plant gathering is widespread). While the proposal claims care would be taken in applying the pesticides in a controlled manner, chemicals do not know boundaries, and will certainly drift much further than anticipated. This would cause greater health and ecological impacts. The pesticides that would be used include persistent and mobile chemicals, including known developmental and reproductive toxins.

U.S. biologists, ecologists and wildlife managers have many effective alternative vegetation management tools, without having to resort to applying toxic chemicals to our public lands. Please choose Option 3 (C).

Thank you for your care and consideration,

Adam W. Rizika
267 Eliot St.
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467
617-731-7847