

05 DEC 22 AM 9:00

Comment on BLM Programmatic EIS for pesticide Vegetation Treatments in Western United States

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

See FL-0001

Mr. Amme,

I am very opposed to the use of pesticides on public lands. This method has numerous longer-term negative consequences. I strongly support the use of Option 3 (C) and traditional methods.

After reviewing the Bureau of Land Management's proposal for pesticide applications to public lands in western states, I urge BLM to choose Option 3 (C) in its proposal, and use alternative control methods, other than pesticides. As a user (and 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). Although the proposal claims care would be taken in applying the pesticides in a controlled manner, these chemicals are known to drift much further than anticipated and cause unexpected 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 a vast array of alternative vegetation management tools to choose from, without having to resort to applying toxic chemicals to our public lands. Please choose Option 3 (C).

Thank you,



Stanley M. Caress PhD