Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/10/2024 8:19:52 PM
First name: MARC
Last name: Daniels
Organization:
Title:
Comments: I am still against the modified Spruce Vegetation Management Project #61599.
I believe that my previous objections still apply:
It is difficult to understand how this new proposal is being presented considering the comments during the scoping comment period in 2022. We the People owners, overwhelmingly weighed in against the Spruce Project#61599 and most wanted it stopped entirely. Is this new proposal a back up incremental strategy originating in the Forest Service Denver and/or Washington DC office, the politicians, the timber industry?
1. The political and bureaucratic situation is again the type of "public service" that in the past generated the idea of bulldozing aspen and chemical spraying of oak in the Black Hills National Forest. Also, I am having thoughts of idiocracy and Prometheus in the Great Basin. We the People have been watching for that long and remember.
2. The Forest Plan is to provide diverse habitats for a variety of life. In a very predominately pine forest, spruce, aspen, oak, willow, birch and etc should be protected and encouraged, not replaced with pine.
3. The Black Hills National Forest is not intended to be a commercial tree farm. The timber industry already has more than its share currently and of future acreage.
4. The Black Hills National Forest already has a very extensive road network. Even temporary roads damage soils and water tables which can take decades or more to recover.
5. The Black Hills Spruce is unique to the the Black Hills and the state tree, so a majority of people have historically appreciated its beauty.