

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/22/2025 2:40:21 PM

First name: DAVE

Last name: MERTZ

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for a lot of good information provided in this EA. I appreciate the display of previous timber sale activity within the project area as well as the information on structural stage percentages. The whole project area has been heavily impacted by the mountain pine beetle and previous logging. You have identified the percentage of 3C in MA 5.1 within the project area as 1%. How up-to-date is this information? The Lyons, Whitetail, Solomon, and Woohoo projects created a lot of 3C, and I have to believe that it amounts to more than 1%. I was curious about the proposed liberation cuts within the Sawbuck project, so I visited two of the proposed units in the north-central part of the project. I was particularly interested in the largest unit. I see where FS Road 192 is already getting heavy maintenance in preparation for this project. I agree that this unit is not in a desirable condition (see attached photo). Presumably due to previous heavy thinning, there is now a substantial understory. I encourage you to leave some reserve trees to soften the visual impact of removing all of the overstory and ask that you commit to thinning the remaining understory. Otherwise, you have just left a situation for someone else down the road to contend with. I saw where you have masticated an area north of road 190, and I was encouraged by that. You have disclosed the project's effects on the structural stage objectives. When the project is completed, 71% of the project area will be either 3A or 4A. You will be lowering the percentage of 4B from 10.2% to 5.7% in MA 5.1. While these are objectives (the objective for 4B is 25%), if you are not going to follow Forest Plan Objectives, you need to clearly justify in your NEPA why you are not following the FP objectives. It does not appear that you have done that. Simply saying the project lowers the fire and bug risk is not sufficient. If that were the case, the FP would have designated the whole Forest to be 3A and 4A (which it is well on its way towards). The structural stage objectives were created for critical wildlife habitat. It does not appear that any structural stage 5, old growth was identified within the project area. Why was that, as it is also below the objective? Is there no potential old growth within the project area? I completely understand the situation that the BHNF is currently under to keep producing unsustainable amounts of timber, and you are doing the best you can with a tough situation. I agree with your treatment on the large, liberation cut. Something needs to be done there. The other liberation cut north of there looks to be marginal from an economic standpoint (see photo). Maybe some of these could be managed under Single Tree Selection instead? Especially if this is going to be an IRSC anyway. The limited amount of the thinning units I saw also looked sketchy from an economic standpoint. I am not against this project; some of this needs to happen, especially the prescribed burning and non-commercial thinning. It's just that a lot of the commercial activity looks like desperation. Good luck with this. I hope you get funding for the non-commercial activities. Thanks for your consideration.