

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 7/11/2025 11:44:37 AM

First name: Stephen

Last name: Pazdziorko

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Please consider the following points:

1)The Forest Service's first responsibility is to protect the wild character of the Mount Timpanogos Wilderness. The agency's own wilderness policy recognizes that a structure is not needed for visitor use, stating that visitors must be prepared on their own to face "inherent risks of adverse weather conditions, isolation, physical hazards, and lack of rapid communications, and that search and rescue may not be as rapid as expected in an urban setting."

2)The Forest Service must analyze and adopt an alternative that lets the Mount Timpanogos Wilderness be wild by allowing the metal remnants of the Quonset hut to fade with time or by using wilderness-compatible means to remove it. The remaining rock and cement could be safely dismantled and allowed to fade back into the Wilderness. The claim that it can't be dismantled (or even repaired) using traditional means is false, as the Forest Service built the hut without motorized equipment.

3)The EA does not detail how many helicopters flights are expected or the duration of the project. It only alleges, without proof, that stock is impractical and stock users (unidentified) said they wouldn't take their animals up there. The Forest Service has wilderness stock. There is no indication the agency asked its own people.

4)For such a massive undertaking, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed, especially because the Forest Service proposes a project in Wilderness involving helicopter flights, motorized equipment, jackhammers, cement mixers, and other motorized tools.

Is this really the best use of resources and what are the tangible benefits?