

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/15/2023 1:47:24 PM

First name: Dave

Last name: Mertz

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I would like to thank the Forest Service for listening to the large number of comments that were submitted during the scoping period. Significant changes were made to this project as a result of that and I appreciate it. Thank you for the many changes that were made to the original proposal including: greatly reducing the timber harvest acreage, eliminating the use of condition-based management, and limiting openings to 40 acres.

However, I have some requests for the current proposed action. I do not understand the discrimination towards spruce in the mixed stands. Yes, succession has occurred in these stands and spruce is now appearing in stands that were once mostly pine. This is a completely natural forest occurrence and should not be seen as something negative. In fact, I would suggest that within stand diversity is a good thing that should be enhanced. In light of the fairly recent mountain pine beetle epidemic, why would you want to move towards more single-species management? That makes no sense with the exception of commercial management. Pine is more commercially valuable than spruce. Is that what this is about?

I would request that you drop those types of activities from this project, and instead, take actions to enhance stand diversity with spruce. Yes, there is the objective in the Forest Plan to manage 20,000 acres of spruce. But just as the timber industry says about structural stage percentages, that's just an objective. There is no reason why the spruce acreage can't be higher than 20,000 acres.

I want to say that I felt that much of the EA was well written and that some the specialist reports were very well done. In particular, the silviculturist and economic impact reports stood out. The economic impact report showed that this project, as proposed, has a PNV of minus \$3,970,000. That is somewhat incredible. Is this project really worth that much to the American taxpayer?

Now, we know who will benefit from this project, and that would be the timber industry. To some extent, that is ok, they need to make money, but the project is obviously heavily subsidized, and I do not believe that you have made the case that the benefits are worth the cost to the taxpayers.

Again, thank you for listening to those that commented and making great strides to improve this project. I do believe there are a few things that can still be done to make it better, as I have outlined here.