

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/28/2024 4:00:00 AM

First name: Terry

Last name: Houck Hoffman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Comments on SERAL 2.0 project:

I find it appalling that the SERAL 2.0 plans that have been put out for the public to review show plans to conduct prescribed burns on private property without contacting the private property owners about these plans! Who planned this? Who thinks they have the authority to carry out these plans? Why didn't your team that was doing "reconnaissance" realize that map 9 shows a large amount of our Brownes Meadows Land as being part of your plans for prescribed burning and possible herbicide treatment?

When I first found out about the SERAL 2.0 information that was available to look over I attempted to find any part of the plan near my property. I found it impossible to see any clearly marked areas on the minuscule maps you post on My Mother Lode or on the maps on the review site. Rivers, towns, and place names are missing on some maps and are so small on others that I gave up after hours of searching on 2 separate occasions. I see this same flaw on maps you post on My Mother Lode over and over again. A map that cannot be enlarged and has no identifying information is useless. My laptop has an 18" screen. If you are trying to notify the public about a control burn that is going to take place the information is seriously failing in getting clear decipherable facts to the public.

Luckily for me, members of my family, who own property bordering my own property made me aware of the plans for prescribed burning on the land owned by my sister and myself.

Ecological Relations Between living organisms and their environment

This is one of the words in the SERAL 2.0 acronym, and yet you are, once again, planning on using herbicides on living organisms in the ecosystems that are in our Sierra Nevada watersheds. This area provides the water for most of the human animal populations in Tuolumne County and in other parts of California.

"[hellip] The acres where herbicides are proposed for fuel-break maintenance have been reduced approximately half compared to what was originally proposed in the scoping document" (Letter sent to me on 2/16/24 by Jason Kuiken)

What I read in the SERAL 2.0 report on pg 32 states that "no potential for future herbicide treatments within the SERAL 2.0 project watersheds outside of those proposed for the SERAL project on private land[hellip] 2000 acres could be treated" What private land are you planning on treating with herbicides and exactly where are you planning on applying them?

Also on page 32 you state that "cumulative effects of herbicide on water quality and human health are not anticipated" Unless you can state unequivocally that herbicide use will not ever effect the health of humans or other animals, be they wild or domestic, you should never use them!

"The risk of adverse health effects is considered acceptable" pg 26. Acceptable by who? The risk of cancer is never acceptable.

"Unlikely that human health standards for workers or the general public would be exceeded" Pg 26

Unlikely is a ridiculous term to use when you are discussing herbicide application over large areas of land. The chances of human error occurring or finding out, to late, that what chemical companies are selling is a "safe"

product for application are instead found to be unsafe is too risky to chance use.

Roundup was believed to be a safe herbicide for many years. Roundup is not safe, and its use has been the cause of cancer in many of the folks who applied it. Ask a Vietnam veteran about what agent orange has done to their health.

Need I remind you of the "unlikely" accidental dumping of herbicides from an aerial method into Rose Creek that drained into the Stanislaus River? This, I suppose, would be categorized as "not anticipated" yet it happened.

This is an idea that I support: Never use herbicides on public or private land. This is the only way that we will never have to worry about "unlikely", "not anticipated" irreparable damage happening to lands that are the headwaters of many people and animals water source, animal habitat for both wild animals and cattle that graze on the grass, and a SAFE place for recreation of all types. It is the responsibility of the national and state forests to preserve and protect our lands without dumping chemicals on them ever!

Please use the most logical, safest and healthiest considerations when determining your decision on herbicide use, and do not cause irreparable damage to our precious resources.

Please take note:

My sister, Judy, and myself do not give you permission to do burning on our privately owned property, nor do we ever want any herbicides near or on our property.

According to map 9, you plan to prescribe burn on nearly half of the acreage of the 3 parcels we own together.

Our cabin, water tank, spring and water delivery system, along with historical and cultural sites are on this privately owned land that is marked on this map as part of your plan to prescribe burn. Our land, in the past, has been grazed by cattle and selectively logged following the rules of our NTMP timber plan. We harvested trees when the mills were not overstocked with bug killed trees during drought times. We managed our land with the well-being of animal habitat given the upmost consideration. My sister and myself are the decision making stewards of property that has been managed by family members since 1857.

On page 6 you state that "any increased erosion from prescribed fire or burning piles has the potential to be filtered out before reaching surface water." Yet you want to burn the entire hillside above my cabin and spring and risk erosion and sediment entering the North Fork of the Tuolumne. Where the "largest increases in ERA would occur" Table 8

I have seen in the past that any prescribed burn has the potential to become an uncontrolled burn. How would private land owners be compensated for monetary loss, replanting, road repairs, destroyed water systems and cabins if a fire you lit harmed our possessions? Who would pay us for lost revenue for our burned timber? This needs to be addressed.

In closing, I do not believe any herbicides should be used on National Forest land because we all own it. I also do not want herbicides used near my property or on it. My sister and I are the owners of our portion of Browne's Meadows. The Stanislaus National Forest does not own it.

Would you please send me a copy of the revised map that shows that our private property is not included in your SERAL 2.0 plan as soon as you revise it?

Anything done on privately owned land must have prior approval by the owner of the land.