

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/2/2026 5:00:00 AM

First name: Vicki

Last name: Disorda

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Let me begin by saying that I would never have learned of this project or the meeting in Brandon if a friend had not emailed me. Nor do I remember there ever being a public meeting for the Telephone Gap Project. A public hearing may not be required as part of the Forest Service's process, but it ought to be. The Forest Service is, after all, a public body. The public should be aware of all projects being conducted by the Forest Service and meetings ought to be available online and be recorded as well. Particularly in this instance where Brandon has the capability to do so at the town hall. That being said, the FS did a good job presenting information about the controlled burn and its process. However, they were very vague about the use of herbicides and generally dismissive of questions surrounding its application. It was stated the Forest Service will "put up signs in areas where herbicides are used so the public will be aware and can choose to avoid the area for a while if they want." At the risk of stating the obvious, animals cannot read. Is there any consideration for their health and safety in the use of carcinogens? (For the record, I have the same concerns for water treatments that require signage notifying humans not to swim in the lake for a certain, yet see families of geese and other wildlife still using the water. In general, I believe the Forest Service and Fish and Wildlife Departments should demonstrate more care for wildlife.) Additionally, if there will be multiple burns over the next 15 - 20 years, why use dangerous chemicals at all? One would think a second or third burn would suffice. One of my greatest concerns is that the acreage of the project is just under the required acres that would prompt certain environmental studies. Less than 30 acres as a matter of fact. Is this by design or is this the actual acreage of the Chandler Ridge region? Either way, the use of Categorical Exclusion in this case appears suspect. It also struck me odd the meeting was held in Brandon when the bulk of the project area is in Middlebury. It was frustrating that no questions were allowed during the Forest Service's presentation and that very little time was allowed for public questions and comments at the end. Frequently we learn as much from one another as we do project administrators, which is precisely why public comments exist. Then when the transparency of the project was questioned by one participant, a gentleman in the front row jumped up in a very defensive manner of the Forest Service and shut him down. It was very intimidating to voice any concerns after that and I left without voicing mine. Perhaps a meeting moderator would be beneficial in these settings. Along the lines of transparency, to quote one of the meeting participants, "How is it fair that all the best available science and analyses will be published after the public comment period?" Lastly, who will reap the financial rewards of mechanical tree removal? This information ought to be disclosed as well. Thank you for taking the time to read my comments,