

FROM : [REDACTED]

Jan. 09 2006 01:00AM P1

FXC-0026

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]
Fax/phone: [REDACTED]

January 8, 2006

Brian Amme, Project Manager
BLM, P.O. Box 12000
Reno, NV 89520-0006
Email: vegis@nv.blm.gov
Fax No.: 775-861-6712

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

Dear Mr. Amme,

1

A petition opposing the subject proposal was emailed to me yesterday. Please find my comments on page two of this document. The petition quotation follows:

"I have reviewed 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 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 for your care and consideration."

Page 2.

Mr. Amme,

2 I have not read the subject proposal ^{yet} and therefore will not urge you "...to choose Option 3 (C)..." but please know that I am deeply concerned at what I read in this petition. This proposed use of herbicides sounds like it parallels the use of Agent Orange and other herbicides in the Viet Nam War era and that it may have similar adverse long-term health consequences to our people, land and wildlife. In my opinion this risk is unacceptable and must not be taken. There is adequate information and even more coming in now (forty years later) which confirm what the consequences actually are when action like this has been taken in the past.

3 We as a people must learn from our history. Our experience with Viet Nam and WWII haunt us today. Among the things we have learned from Viet Nam is that exposure to herbicides results in long-term adverse health effects (like Type II Diabetes). There are similar consequences from the use of DDT and the list goes on.

4 Forecasting the future from the past suggests that when our nation and the world has to bear the consequences of spraying these 17 western states, our people in particular and the world's people in general may rightfully be outraged and consider those who decided to disregard predictable consequences to be accountable for their actions and to have acted irresponsibly.

5 **Please do not spray!** Instead please find a safe alternative means to address the problems.

Sincerely,

This letter is intended for those who must make the decisions this letter addresses. In all cases my personal information is to be considered confidential and is not to be available to the public.