



"Rick Shuster"
<rgsjesshuster@att.net>
07/30/2010 02:03 PM

To <orvegtreatments@blm.gov>
cc <ArmrAngel@aol.com>, <vn.dioxin@yahoo.com>
bcc
Subject Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in Oregon Final EIS now available

TO:
Mr. Ken Denton, Ken_Denton@blm.gov
Vegetation Treatments EIS team
PO Box 2965
Portland OR 97208-2965
orvegtreatments@blm.gov

Mr Denton,

I received this date, 7/30/10, 2 Volumes; via US Mail

*Final Environmental Impact Statement
Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in Oregon*

Admittedly there is much to read, but a quick review appears to have no direct or obvious references to dioxin herbicides. Since dioxins remain a most significant concern, as having long term health effects on human, animal and other life forms, it was my hope to find clarification if any and/or statement of no use of dioxin herbicides in the *Final Environmental Impact Statement* for the proposed *Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in Oregon*.

Thank You

Richard G. Shuster
7062 Cinnamon Drive
Sparks, NV 89436
rgsjesshuster@att.net

-----Original Message-----
From: Ken_Denton@blm.gov [mailto:Ken_Denton@blm.gov] On Behalf Of orvegtreatments@blm.gov
Sent: Friday, July 30, 2010 10:53 AM
To: orvegtreatments@blm.gov
Subject: Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in Oregon Final EIS now available

Dear Interested Party,

The Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in Oregon Final Environmental Impact is now available. The document can be downloaded at <http://www.blm.gov/or/plans/vegtreatmentseis/>, or you can request a printed copy by contacting the team at the addresses below. If you have already requested a printed copy, you will be receiving it shortly.

Thank you for your interest in this process,
The EIS Team

Vegetation Treatments EIS team
PO Box 2965
Portland OR 97208-2965
orvegtreatments@blm.gov



"Artemio Paz Jr."
<artemio@apazarchitect.com
>

07/31/2010 07:49 AM

To <orvegtratements@blm.gov>

cc

bcc

Subject: Vegetation Treatment EIS

Dear BLM,

I am a small woodland lot owner of an FSC certified 40 acre forestry managed property in the lower McKenzie Watershed. My wife and I have had FSC certification for 11 years and BLM property is contiguous to the south property line and one 40 acre parcel to the east of our property at 86950 Cedar Flat Road, Springfield. Also, I have had an organic blueberry field on the property for 21 years with Oregon Tilth Certification for 14 years. Our property is free of any use of pesticides, herbicide or fungicide use in the landscape to protect the natural water shed and the health of the flora and fauna.

We are concerned with the pervasive use of synthetic chemicals such as those industrial forestry companies are using in the Lower McKenzie Water shed and throughout the forest lands of Oregon. Consequently, I am encouraged that BLM has initiated a study of vegetation treatment using herbicide in the form of an environmental impact statement (EIS) to assist in establishing a current base line of information the the citizens of Oregon can use as one source of reference and information to help guide policy makers for the protection of Oregon residents, our wildlife and recreational visitors and the children and our grandchildren that will all be effected by the health of our unique forestry in Oregon. Having said this, I am hoping that your final EIS report is guided by the highest standards of care in protecting the health and well being of Oregon's citizens and will maintain the fiduciary responsibility to those citizens and our guest and visitors of the State of Oregon.

I would like to request a hard copy of the "Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides in BLM Lands in Oregon, Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)", July 2010. The document can be sent to my office and home address below where my wife and I have lived for 42 years.

Respectfully,

Artemio (Art) Paz, Jr.

--
APAZ Architect, AIA
86950 Cedar Flat Road
Springfield, OR 97478
541.744.2046 Tel
541.744.1017 Fax
www.apazarchitect.com



stuart phillips
<stulips@hotmail.com>
08/30/2010 11:13 AM

To <orvegtrtments@blm.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject Comment on Final Plan for Vegetation Treatments

Please do not use Alternative 4 for pesticide spraying on any blm lands for vegetation treatment, please use NO PESTICIDES OR HERBICIDE SPRAYING ON ANY BLM LANDS IN WESTERN OREGON AT ALL, AS THESE CHEMICALS ARE HIGHLY TOXIC AND NEED NOT BE USED ON ANY BLM LANDS IN OREGON AT ALL. SO PLEASE DO NOT USE ALTERNATIVE #4 AS YOUR GUIDANCE PLAN, PLEASE USE AN ALTERNATIVE OF HAND REMOVAL OF INVASIVE SPECIES WITHOUT THE USE OF ANY PESTICIDES OR HERBICIDES AT ALL, or simply no action taken alternative, as this would harm the environment much less than using pesticides or herbicides as vegetative treatment. thankyou, stuart phillips, eugene, oregon



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 10

1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98101-3140

OFFICE OF
ECOSYSTEMS, TRIBAL AND
PUBLIC AFFAIRS

August 30, 2010

Mr. Todd Thompson
Restoration Coordinator
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
P.O. Box 2965
Portland, Oregon 97208-2965

Re: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) comments for the Vegetation Treatments using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Lands in Oregon Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). EPA Project Number: 08-045-BLM

Dear Mr. Thompson:

EPA has reviewed your FEIS and we are submitting comments in accordance with our responsibilities under NEPA and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act (CAA).

Our comments on the DEIS focused on monitoring and evaluation methods to determine if herbicide application rates are effective, buffers are sufficient, drift is minimized and specific goals and endpoints are being met. To this end, we recommended that Part II of Appendix 3, "Potential Monitoring" be incorporated into all action alternatives. While "Potential Monitoring" was not incorporated into all action alternatives, we would agree it makes sense that any required monitoring should be linked directly to impacts identified for the selected alternative. We agree that if the EIS has not identified adverse impacts that would need or benefit from "potential monitoring", it should not be implemented. The likelihood of meaningful monitoring results should be such that a deferral of funds from direct weed control efforts is justified.

Additional information in the FEIS on the Northwest Forest Plan Aquatic and Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring Program (AREMP), PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinion (PIBO) Effectiveness Monitoring Program, and, National Invasive Species Information Management System (NISIMS), generally addresses our concerns about *state-wide* monitoring for the effectiveness of herbicide use against weed spread and the effectiveness of mitigation measures for protecting non-target resources. Edits to Appendix 3 which better describe existing BLM policy direction on how the critical components of a treatment area's environment should dictate site specific monitoring requirements (FEIS, p. 472) are responsive to our concern that the DEIS insufficiently disclosed minimum requirements for *site-specific* effectiveness monitoring.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment and if you have any questions or concerns please contact Erik Peterson of my staff at (206) 553-6382 or by electronic mail at peterson.erik@epa.gov

Sincerely,



Christine Reichgott, Manager
Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit