

From: BarbC <barbc624@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 3:49 PM
To: Vegetation Treatment Program@BOF
Subject: Latest Draft Version Proposed Vegetation Treatment Program by CalFire and the California Board of Forestry

he 2016 Draft PEIR: The Same Errors Over and Over Again

In the latest draft:

- Potential impacts are dismissed without support
- Mitigations of impacts are unenforceable and unmeasurable
- Clearance of northern chaparral is justified by logical fallacies
- Research of several scientists continues to be misrepresented (despite corrections being submitted)
- Lack of transparency remains a significant issue

One of the most egregious examples of the DPEIR's failure is the continued use of outdated and inadequate spatial data that provides the foundation for the entire Program. Although updated data is available from Cal Fire itself, **the DPEIR ignores this rich resource** and depends instead on questionable information from decades ago.

As a consequence, the current EIR fails to meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The DPEIR also reveals **a significant number of inconsistencies** as the document initially references current science to only qualify or ignore it later in order to support the Program's objectives. By using contradictory statements, undefined terms, and legally inadequate mitigation processes, the document is a testament in ambiguity. It appears to be a program in search of confirming data rather than one developed from examining the actual problem.

The most concerning issue, however, relates to the failure of the document to provide a key component of a programmatic EIR - providing a more exhaustive consideration of effects and cumulative impacts than could be accomplished at the project level (14 CCR § 15168).

Instead, volumes of repetitive text are punctuated with the unsupported claim that determining impacts is impossible, pushing it off to project managers to determine with a checklist and standard project requirements that depend on subjective judgments.

How does the DPEIR justify ignoring a thorough examination of impacts as required by CEQA? The DPEIR vacillates between claiming the Program is too large and complex to analyze, or the actual treatment areas are too small to have an impact.

As a consequence, the current DPEIR fails to provide adequate support for concluding that the proposed program will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Briefly, the reasons for these failures include:

- 1. Circumventing CEQA** - impacts determined to be less than significant by the "Fallacy of Authority" (our conclusions are true because we say so – no evidence provided)
- 2. Substandard Research** - misrepresenting cited scientific literature and dependence on anecdotal evidence
- 3. Inadequate Data** - outdated fire hazard analysis model/data unsuitable for project level planning

The DPEIR also fails to properly address the impacts the Program may have on **carbon emissions and the loss of carbon sequestration** by the clearance of native habitats.

Please do your job properly and address the problems in your latest draft so as to create a program that will not adversely affect our environment.

Regards;

Barbara Cohn