

Middle East Fork Project Summary of Objection Issues and Suggested Remedies

Project Name: Middle East Fork Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project

Objector: Engstedt, Ellen

Objection Number: 0016

Issue 1. (PROCESS) "We strongly object to the analysis of ...Alternative 3. It is an affront...to call a "concept" an alternative and to carry the insult even farther and attempt to analyze it."

Suggested remedy: "In the future, we would strongly suggest the Forest Service analyze proposals that are real and not "conceptual".

Regional Review and Response: The objector's suggested remedy is appreciated and will be considered. The Region understands and respects that the objector does not agree with the Forest Supervisor's decision to analyze Alternative 3. The reasons for this decision are explained on pages 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, 2-6, and 2-56 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Alternative 3 was analyzed because it provided the decision maker with a contrast in approaches to meeting the purpose and need – and in fact, it does show a significant difference in meeting the purpose and need based on the objective measurement criteria as summarized on pages 2-32, 2-33 and 2-34. This is also addressed in the response to Public Concern 10002 (Volume 2, Appendix H, p. 78 of 193) and Public Concern 10016 (p. 86 of 193).