

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/6/2020 4:46:18 PM

First name: Judy

Last name: Patton

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I have many concerns about the Foothills Landscape Project. I will go over only 3 major concerns in this particular letter.

1) I am opposed to Chemical spraying in ANY National Forest but specifically no chemicals in the National Forest that I live close to and use for recreation, aesthetic beauty, and recharging my psyche. So many waterways could be contaminated by the chemical run off. Especially repugnant to me are the extremely dangerous herbicides in the Neonicotinoid family and the "Forever" surfactants and binders in the PSAF or PTOA family (key ingredients in the manufacture of Teflon), or any other chemical binder, for that matter. These are not a mix for such vast areas as too many creatures depend on the forest for their food supply. High percentage Vinegar and Dawn Dish Detergent will achieve the same end result. The people spraying the herbicides may not be particularly careful in their application. Some may not know the difference between wild azaleas and privet. So who can say how many natives plants, wild blueberries, ferns, mycobacterium, etc. will meet their demise, along with the animals and birds who eat from those plants? How many fish will die from the run off into the waterways? I say NO to chemical use in the National Forest.

2) I am opposed to clear cutting and logging vast areas of National Forests. The run off could be disastrous just from the temporary roads built for the equipment to get into some areas. Selectively choosing trees that are dead or unhealthy to clear is fine and understandable. The scope you have mentioned is vast and the outcome impact is too unknown. We the people would like to be able to trust that you would make good decisions for the health of the forest. My first two concerns are areas where trust from your agency is vital.

3) The following concern is tricky. In my opinion there has not been sufficient time for the public to review a thousand page EA, especially since the public comment period surrounded two major holidays (Christmas and New Year). It seems impossible for the general public to digest and then write their concerns and comments within a 30 day period. Therefore, the public comment period must be extended. Something of this size needs a reasonable time frame within which to provide the Forest Service with their concerns and ideas. This appears to be arbitrary. Another problem I see is the fact there is ONLY an EA. A project of this magnitude should have nothing less than an EIS. All the citizens and stakeholders should be able to see what the impact of such a massive decision would be, if the project were to go through. At present this is depriving the public of DUE PROCESS.