

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 7/11/2025 11:55:40 AM

First name: Marie Louise Morandi

Last name: Long Zwicker

Organization:

Title:

Comments: It is my understanding that the Forest Service proposes to reconstruct a useless, dilapidated, sheet metal Quonset hut in the Mount Timpanogos Wilderness along the Wasatch Front in northern Utah that was damaged by snow during the winter of 2021-2022. As part of the construction plan, the agency would invade the Wilderness with helicopters, jackhammers, cement mixers, and other motorized equipment. Absurdly the Forest Service claims that rebuilding the structure would improve the area's wilderness character.

The Mount Timpanogos Wilderness must be protected from the Forest Service's foolhardy project. The Forest Service must let the Wilderness be wild by allowing the hut to fade with time, or by using wilderness-compatible means to remove the collapsed hut's remnants.

The 20 x 18-foot metal Quonset hut with a cemented rock retaining wall was originally completed in 1960. Prior to the area's 1984 wilderness designation, the hut provided shelter and restrooms for an annual public group hike that was first organized in 1912. The hut was used during this annual hike until the event's excessive impacts caused the Forest Service to ask hike organizers to end it after 8,000 people attempted to reach Mount Timpanogos' summit during the 1969 group hike. So, the group hike ended, and about 15 years later the area became part of the Mount Timpanogos Wilderness. The hut's condition deteriorated over the decades and collapsed during the winter of 2021-2022.

The Wilderness Act prohibits structures, with a very narrow exception for those that are the minimum necessary to preserve Wilderness-a high bar to achieve. This out-of-place hut not only detracts from the Wilderness, but also fails to meet this Wilderness Act requirement.

Only the "no action" alternative would honor the Mount Timpanogos Wilderness because alternatives that used traditional skills, like those used to build the structure, were rejected for consideration in the draft Environmental Assessment.

The natural deterioration of structures is part of Wilderness-it is evidence of untrammelled and timeless natural processes reclaiming the Wilderness from temporary human occupation. Structures should be removed if that can be done in a manner consistent with wilderness principles and if the impact from removing the structure is less than the impact from leaving the structure. This hut is not listed on the national register of historic places, though it has been proposed for listing. Even if listed, it could be documented and allowed to fade into the Wilderness.

The arguments that must be made to support the "no action" alternative are:

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.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

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.