

confirmed the address for AWR had not changed. Other parties included in the mailing did submit comments. None of the mailings were returned "undeliverable".

Based on my review of the project history, you are correct in determining you have standing as it was the Forest's intent to provide standing to object under 36 CFR 218 for anyone who responded during scoping—which you did. While you have standing to file an objection, there is the matter of whether your objection meets the requirements of 36 CFR 218.

As with past objections you have submitted, you failed to provide a statement that demonstrates the connection between prior specific written comments on the particular proposed project or activity and the content of the objection (unless the objection concerns an issue that arose after the designated opportunity for comment) as required by 36 CFR 218.8(d)(6). 36 CFR 218.8(c) states that issues raised in objections must be based on previously submitted specific written comments regarding the proposed project or activity and attributed to the objector, unless the issue is based on new information that arose after the opportunities to comment. You did submit a letter during the scoping period.

Comments submitted in January 2011 on the 2010 Trapper Creek EA no longer apply as the EA and decision were withdrawn and interested parties were informed (April 16, 2013 letter from Forest Supervisor Myers) a "new environmental analysis" and a "new decision to conduct any future activities associated with the project" would be completed. You did not submit comments on the new, April 2014 EA. Therefore, your issues are limited to those raised during scoping. You fail to demonstrate how the issues raised in your objection are based on issues you raised in scoping. You include the following statement in your objection: "I raised this issue in my last appeal of the Trapper Creek project." Your appeal is moot as it applied to a decision that was withdrawn and issues raised in the appeal were not submitted in response to an opportunity for public comment for the 2014 EA and DDN (36 CFR 218.5).

Further review of your objection found that, similar to your previously submitted objections (Little Belt Hazard Tree Removal, Lewis & Clark NF; Blackfoot Travel Plan and Associated Forest Plan Amendments, Helena NF; East Reservoir, Kootenai NF; South Bridger Interface, Gallatin NF), it does not meet the requirements of 36 CFR 218.8 for the following reasons:

- 1) You did not include all the documents you cited with the objection (36 CFR 218.8(b)). Furthermore, you did not even include a list of references cited so we cannot determine the title of studies/articles you are referring to.
- 2) It is evident that you have not included a clear description of those aspects of the proposed project, as analyzed in 2014, that you believe are in violation of law, regulation or policy, including specific issues related to the proposed project (218.8(d)(5)). I conducted a thorough content analysis of your objection and found that you merely resubmitted the appeal filed in April 2012, with some sections deleted and references to the DN updated to "DDN". Not once did you cite to information in the 2014 EA or 2014 DDN for the Trapper Creek project.