

You continue to make broad, vague allegations that the analysis is not sufficient or best science was not used. However, you do not demonstrate how or why the analysis is insufficient, you do not articulate why the science you reference is more appropriate than the science considered, and/or you do not even identify what you believe the best science is in some instances. While your objection issues may appear to have some relationship to the proposed action (i.e. you raise an issue regarding lynx because lynx habitat is found within the project area and may be affected by the proposed actions), your objection issues are not specific to the analysis or draft decision rationale for the applicable project. Instead, you continue your practice of copying and pasting comments and objection issues from numerous past projects across Region 1 and your past Trapper Creek appeal. By not citing to the analysis or draft decision rationale specific to a project, you are not demonstrating how the analysis or the rationale are inadequate. Therefore, I find you are not meeting the requirement to include supporting reasons for the responsible official to consider or for the objection reviewing officer to review (36 CFR 218.8(d)(5) and (6); 218.10(5)).

In David E. Schmid's June 30, 2014 letter to you, he noted that, given your continued refusal to meet the requirements of 36 CFR 218 when submitting objections, your recycling of content submitted in your previous appeals/objections that is not specific to the project being objected to, and your declining our offers to meet, it seems your organization is not interested in participating in the objection process as a means of improving and informing Forest Service land management decisions. He also informed you in the June 30th letter that he was instructing the regional staff to thoroughly apply the requirements of 36 CFR 218 for all future objections submitted on behalf of Alliance for the Wild Rockies as we believe you have been sufficiently notified as to what is required to meet the 36 CFR 218 requirements. These instructions were followed and your objection to the South Bridger Interface project was dismissed because it still did not meet the 36 CFR 218 requirements.

As demonstrated in numbers 1 and 2 above, the Trapper Creek objection also does not meet the requirements 36 CFR 218 requirements. I am, therefore, setting your objection aside from review in accordance with 36 CFR 218.10(5).

Sincerely,



FAYE L. KRUEGER
Regional Forester

cc: Melany I Glossa, Jan M Bowey, Ray G Smith