

**Hannigan, Edith@BOF**

---

**From:** Mark Hunter <funkshn@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 31, 2016 10:21 AM  
**To:** Vegetation Treatment Program@BOF  
**Subject:** The VTP is inadequate for a project with such major impact

A quarter of the entire state. The best that CalFire can come up with is to devastate the habitat across a quarter of the state in the name of preventing fire threats to people and property.

The tail is really wagging the dog, here. It's reminiscent of the famous Vietnam War statement, "We had to destroy the village in order to save it." This is an impact that can't possibly be mitigated.

If this is the level of destruction that you propose, it had better be justified by the best science and the best evidence available. And it isn't. In the criminal justice system, death penalty trials have an even more rigorous level of scrutiny and protections than other felony trials. In contrast, your scorched-earth plan justifies itself with outdated information and manipulation of scientific papers. It's inadequate and unprofessional. You have an obligation to do better.

You could trash HALF the state and still not be able to protect human habitation from wildfires. Flying embers travel huge distances. Why isn't there any emphasis on retrofitting houses so that they don't catch fire so easily? Why isn't there more emphasis on restricting development in areas where fire geography makes development unsafe? Fire protection and fuel reduction have some overlap, but they are not one and the same. Which of those is truly your mission?

You're going to scalp the state, leaving ugliness and biological damage in your wake, and you still won't accomplish your goal. Why can't you see that in advance, instead of only in hindsight?

Stating that you are compliant with CEQA doesn't mean that you actually are. Wouldn't your department's energies be better spent mending the current flaws in the plan rather than battling a legal action?

Mark Hunter  
La Canada