

*Note: This document summarizes and sometimes paraphrases the individual objections described in each objection letter. This document is intended only to help members of the public determine which objection letters they may be interested in reading and is not intended to replace or interpret the objector's specific objections.*

*Additionally the summary provides a preliminary ruling on whether or not the objector has standing for each of their specific objections based on whether or not the objector has ever provided formal comments on that issue in the past. The final determination of standing will be made by the Reviewing Official.*

## **Kootenai NF Objection Letters (Objection Process 09/27/13 – 11/26/13)**

**OBJ – Objection Number**

**CL – Original Comment Letter Number**

**STDG – Standing of Objection**

<b>OBJ. #</b>	<b>CL #</b>	<b>LAST NAME</b>	<b>FIRST NAME</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>STDG</b>
14-13-00-0001	235	Munther	Greg	Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, Montana Chapter	1	Our objection is related to management direction on a specific drainage: the Silver Butte-Fisher River.	Y
14-13-00-0004	145	Davis	Stanley		1	Alternative B Modified does nothing to correct the fraud which caused the loss of trust in the Forest Service employees ever actually caring for the land and serving people	N
14-13-00-0006	115	O'Brien	John		1	Climate Change	N
14-13-00-0007	242	King	Robyn	Executive Director Yaak Valley Forest Council	1	Factual inaccuracies within the Forest Plan	Y
					2	Forest Plan fails to honor collaborative agreements and applies selective use of the collaborative process	Y
					3	Lack of Recommended Wilderness in the Forest Plan	Y
14-13-00-0009	295	Finney	John		1	Combine MA5a, MA5b, and MA5c into a single MA5 Backcountry.	Y
					2	Change Northwest Peak MA3 Special Interest Area to MA5.	Y
					3	Change all MA5a to MA5c in the Yaak GA.	Y
					4	Change all or significant portions of MA5a to MA5c in the Bull GA.	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
					5	Change MA5a south of road 322 to MA5c in the Clark GA.	Y
					6	Change the Generally Suitable Table for MA3 around the Ten Lakes Scenic Area to provide for Motorized – Winter.	Y
14-13-00-0012	NA	Kelly	Cary	Chairman Bonner County Board of Commissioners	1	The allocating of Backcountry into separate designations in the MA5a, MA5b, and MA5c subcategories designation similarly makes on-the-ground changes to existing motorized use and/or would pre-determine a decision in the future for travel management pursuant to the revised plan.	N
					2	Grazing	N
14-13-00-0015	332	Dinning	Dan	Chairman Boundary County Commissioners	1	Objects to any areas of Recommended Wilderness	Y
					2	No consideration or analysis given regarding local law enforcement, national security agencies, etc. where the road system is restricted to administrative use only	N
14-13-00-0016	261	Fielder	Paul		1	I object to the adoption of the "Forest Plan Amendments for Motorized Access Management within the Selkirk and Cabinet-Yaak Grizzly Bear Recovery Zones" Record of Decision (with its road closures and road density standards intended to protect grizzly bears) into the Kootenai Forest Plan.	Y
14-13-00-0017	293/337	Voyles	Jim	President Ten Lakes Snowmobile Club	1	We object to the proposal to manage the northern portion of the Whitefish Divide area as MA 1B – Recommended Wilderness.	Y
					2	We object to the proposal to manage Big Creek, Little North Fork Big Creek, Good Creek, North Fork Big Creek, Copeland Creek, Drop Creek, South Fork Big Creek, East Branch of South Fork Big Creek, West Branch of South Fork Big Creek, Yaak River, West Fork Yaak River, Vinal Creek, Bull River, North Fork Bull River, Middle Fork Bull River, Bighorn Creek, East Fork Bull River, and Vermillion River as Management Area 2 – Eligible Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers.	Y
					3	We object to all portions of the Kootenai National Forest Land Management Plan 2013 revision which are related to questions posed to KNF officials by TLSC members during the DLMP comment period which were never answered.	Y
					4	We object to the KNF's proposal to manage portions of the town of Eureka's municipal watershed as MA1b – Recommended Wilderness.	Y
					5	We object to the fact that Kootenai National Forest, under direction from Region 1 of the USDA Forest Service, has adopted a policy to manage Recommended Wilderness management areas as if they were congressionally designated wilderness, despite the fact that the public has not had sufficient opportunity to comment on this policy, and this policy has not been approved by the Congress of the United States, the only official body legally designate wilderness.	Y
					6	We object to the process and protocol which were utilized to designate Inventory Roadless Areas (IRA's) in Region 1 of the Forest Service, and on the KNF. We also object to the evaluation process for wilderness	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
						characteristics applied to the IRA's currently designated on the KNF.	
					7	We object to the proposal to manage the area within the Whitefish Divide area from Williams Creek south to the KNF forest boundary and east to the KNF forest boundary as MA 5a - Backcountry non-motorized year round.	Y
					8	We object to the KNF's proposal to designate 36 additional special areas (MA 3), totaling 30,635 acres, and three additional research natural areas (MA 4), totaling 3,226 acres. We also object to the proposal to increase the size of the Northwest Peaks, and Ten Lakes, scenic areas.	Y
					9	We object to the assertion that the KNF utilized the "Best Available Science" throughout the plan revision process.	
					10	We object to the management policies proposed in the name of species currently listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act including; Grizzly Bears and Canada Lynx.	Y
					11	We object to the reductions in motorized forest access and recreation opportunities on the KNF that will result from the implementation of Alternative B modified.	Y
14-13-00-0019	330	Fielder	Jennifer	Senator	1	My objections to the KNF plan is based on improper public notice; failure to acknowledge or meaningfully respond to all comments submitted; failure to use best scientific information; improper inventory, analysis and designations of IRA, Proposed Wilderness, & Back Country; biased focus on closing roads and trails despite law and facts; inadequate socio-economic analysis; prohibition of multiple uses and economic production in areas where multiple uses and economic production are compatible; lack of jurisdiction; planned conditions leading to severe, adverse impacts on forest health, environment, economy, and human health, safety and welfare; unjust prohibitions on motorized access, timber production, multiple use access, and resource management flexibility; timber production far below actual sustained yield capability; failure to follow applicable laws in planning protocols and public information process; incorrect presumption of broad public support; negligence; errors and omissions; and concealed, misleading, and false Information issued by USFS Officials which manipulated plan outcome, discouraged the local public's understanding of plan implications, and dissuaded pertinent public involvement and submittal of comments.	Y in part
14-13-00-0020	327, 334, 358 (duplicate letters)	McKenzie	Paul	F.H. Stoltze Land & Lumber Co.	1	We object to the wording stating: "A sustainable mix of timber products (including both sawtimber and non-sawtimber) is offered under a variety of harvest and contract methods in response to market demand."	Y
					2	We object to the inclusion of an objective that sets a budget constrained timber sale volume target substantially below the stated ASQ and which will also result in shortfalls on all fronts in meeting the stated desired future conditions, both ecological and societal, for the rest of the forest plan.	Y
					3	MA2-STD-TBR-01 Wild: Timber Harvest is not allowed in eligible wild river segments. We disagree with this statement based on the fact that the process used to identify "wild" river segments is not entirely consistent with	N

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
						the eligibility requirements and to treat such segments as wild prior to official designation is disingenuous.	
14-13-00-0021	9, 74, 187, 332, 351	Berget	Anthony	Chairman Lincoln County Commissioners	1	We believe that the plan inadequately considers the economic impacts that the management policies proposed in Alternative B modified will have on the residents of Lincoln County Montana.	Y
					2	We object to the amount of timber harvest volume that the KNF Forest Plan forecasts to offer as a stated objective, (47.5 MMBF/year), over the first decade of the plan.	Y
					3	We object to the fact that the KNF did not consider all county plans as the planning process developed, and did not sufficiently consider the input provided by Lincoln County when formulating the KNF Revised Plan.	Y in part
					4	I object to the proposal to manage Big Creek, Little North Fork Big Creek, Good Creek, North Fork Big Creek, Copeland Creek, Drop Creek, South Fork Big Creek, East Branch of South Fork Big Creek, West Branch of South Fork Big Creek, Yaak River, West Fork Yaak River, Vinal Creek, Bull River, North Fork Bull River, Middle Fork Bull River, Bighorn Creek, East Fork Bull River, and Vermillion River as Management Area2 - Eligible Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers.	Y
					5	We object to proposal within the KNF Forest Plan Revision to designate Roderick, Whitefish Divide, Scotchman's Peak, and attachments to the existing Cabinet Mountain Wilderness as "Recommended Wilderness". We also object to the proposal to manage the southern portion of the Whitefish Divide area as MA5a - Backcountry non-motorized year round.	Y
					6	We object to the KNF's proposal to manage portions of the town of Eureka's municipal watershed as MA1b - Recommended Wilderness.	Y
					7	We object to the fact that Kootenai National Forest, under direction rom Region 1 of the USDA Forest Service, has adopted a policy for the management of Recommended Wilderness management areas that has not been properly assessed through the National Environmental Policy Act.	Y
14-13-00-0022	287	Hough	Philip	Executive Director Friends of Scotchman Peaks Wilderness	1	We believe that the Revised Land Management Plan (RLMP) for the Kootenai National Forest (KNF) makes a poor and unsubstantiated choice in changing the boundary of the Scotchman Peaks Recommended Wilderness (SPRW) in the vicinity of the East Fork of Blue Creek (on the southern end of the Scotchman Peaks road-less area near the boundary of the Kootenai and Idaho Panhandle National forests).	Y
14-13-00-0024	320	Olson	Keith	Executive Director Montana Logging Association	1	FW-OBJ-TBR-01. Annually offer timber for sale at the estimated predicted volume sold of 47.5MMBF. We object to the inclusion of an objective that sets a budget constrained timber sale volume target rather than a timber sale volume that that will allow the Agency to meet the stated desired future condition for the forest.	Y
14-13-00-0026	321	Garrity	Michael	Alliance for the Wild Rockies	1	NEPA and NFMA procedures for responding to public comment were not followed	Y
					2	The Forest Plan does not include an adequate range of alternatives.	Y
					3	Many LMP Objectives are not linked with LMP Goals, as required.	N
					4	The use of the word "Should" in Forest Plan Direction raises red flags in terms of the level of discretion it allows land managers to have in following	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
						the letter of the Standards, Guidelines, etc.	
					5	"Short term" and "long term" are not defined. AWR comments stated,	Y
					6	FW-DC-VEG-01. The desired ranges for dominance groups are not supported by reliable historic data taken from KNF surveys or scientific research that we are aware of. The Forest Service has not explained how the effects of climate change and white pine blister rust affect the attainability of those desired ranges.	N
					7	FW-DC-VEG-02. The desired ranges for dominance groups are not supported by reliable historic data taken from KNF surveys or scientific research that we are aware of. The Forest Service has not explained how the effects of climate change and white pine blister rust affect the attainability of those desired ranges.	N
					8	FW-DC-VEG-03. The term "substantial amounts" is not defined.	N
					9	FW-DC-VEG-04. The implied assertion that trees are generally too dense on the KNF is not supported by specific reliable historic data gathered from KNF surveys or science that we are aware of.	N
					10	FW-DC-VEG-05. The desired increase in size of forest patches in the seedling and sapling size classes and decreases in size of forest patches in the small and medium size classes is not supported by specific reliable historic data gathered from KNF surveys or science that we are aware of.	N
					11	FW-DC-VEG-06. The implied assertion that root fungi and forest insects are causing too much tree mortality on the KNF is not supported by specific reliable historic data gathered from KNF surveys or science that we are aware of.	N
					12	FW-DC-VEG-07. The desired ranges for snags are not supported by reliable historic data taken from KNF surveys or scientific research that we are aware of.	Y
					13	FW-DC-VEG-11. The desired ranges for forest composition, structure, and pattern for each biophysical setting are not supported by reliable historic data taken from KNF surveys or scientific research that we are aware of.	N
					14	FW-STD-VEG-01. This Standard's allowance of active mechanical treatments in old growth ignores the scientific fact that such active management is the very antithesis of old growth.	Y
					15	Old Growth. As discussed in AWR's comments, the LMP contains no minimum acreage or distribution requirements for maintaining old growth, as does the 1987 plan.	Y
					16	FW-GDL-VEG-03. The Forest Service does not cite the scientific basis for the minimum amounts of coarse woody debris to be retained under this Guideline. It is unclear if the use of the word "should" is intended to recognize the second consistency requirement on page 4 of the LMP, or if it is intended to render the entire Guideline to be discretionary, as courts have interpreted "should."	Y
					17	FW-GDL-VEG-04. The Forest Service does not cite the scientific basis for the minimum amounts of snags to be retained under this Guideline.	Y
					18	FW-GDL-VEG-05. It is unclear if the use of the word "should" is intended to recognize the second consistency requirement on page 4 of the LMP, or if it	N

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
						is intended to render the entire Guideline to be discretionary, as courts have interpreted "should."	
					19	FW-GDL-VEG-06. It is unclear if the use of the word "should" is intended to recognize the second consistency requirement on page 4 of the LMP, or if it is intended to render the entire Guideline to be discretionary, as courts have interpreted "should."	N
					20	FW-GDL-VEG-08. The first sentence, coupled with the consistency requirement on page 4, suggests that any silvicultural system may be used in any proposed treatment unit, regardless of its appropriateness.	N
					21	FW-DC-FIRE-02. Essentially, this Desired Condition can be used to justify treatments regardless if they result in forest conditions that would not likely occur naturally, or if the biophysical setting would require frequent, intensive fuel treatments to maintain the Forest Service's desired fuel conditions.	N
					22	MA6-GDL-FIRE-01. This Guideline directs "fuels are reduced, particularly within the wildland urban interface, to reduce the threat of wildland fire" and has the same problems as FW-DC-FIRE-02. It is also redundant.	N
					23	FW-DC-FIRE-03. It is likely that the vague language in this Desired Condition would essentially nullify its intent that recognizes the desirability of wildland fire.	N
					24	FW-OBJ-FIRE-02. The numbers must specify acres rather than fire starts; and this should affect a much more significant portion of the KNF than the wording of this objective implies—to be determined subject to the test of good science and full and fair analysis.	N
					25	Clearly, the Draft Plan Elements needs much stronger direction and certainty for use of wildland fire for resource benefits.	N
					26	The major flaw in the Watershed Condition Ratings is that there is no enforceable threshold associated with the conditions of the watersheds to impede or approve of a level of permitted activities.	Y
					27	The watershed, soils, riparian and aquatic habitat/species section is rife with discretionary language. As a result, the standards, guidelines, goals and objectives are arbitrary.	Y
					28	FW-OBJ-WTR-01. This Objective provides a very minimal target of improving only 15% of subwatersheds over 15 years	N
					29	FW-OBJ-WTR-02. This Objective seems to prioritize management (logging, fuel reduction) because of its language "improve... across acres of subwatersheds..."	N
					30	FW-GDL-WTR-01. This guideline offers little to no protection to the impaired waters on the KNF.	N
					31	FW-GDL-WTR-02. The meaning of "hydrologic stability" is unclear.	N
					32	As AWR comments recognized, the Watershed Disturbance Rating strongly suggests forestwide direction to attain watershed restoration. Yet there are no forestwide standards for those parameters, which would provide much stronger prioritization towards meeting forestwide Watershed and Water Quality Desired Conditions than the LMP includes.	Y
					33	FW-DC-SOIL-01. This Desired Condition states, "Physical, biological, and chemical properties of soil are within the recommended levels by soil type as described in the KNF soil inventory." The properties are not explicitly	N

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
						described to provide meaningful direction.	
					34	FW-DC-SOIL-02. The meaning of the sentence "Areas with sensitive and highly erodible soils or landtypes with mass failure potential are not destabilized as a result of management activities" is unclear.	N
					35	FW-DC-SOIL-03. The meaning of the term "Managed areas" is unclear.	N
					36	FW-OBJ-SOIL-01. The Forest Service sets as its only soil Objective for the next 15 years what it would take a trained operator to do in 15 days. The meaning of "not meeting soil quality criteria" is unclear.	N
					37	There are no soil quality standards in the LMP.	Y
					38	There is no LMP requirement to quantify, minimize, or even consider the total amount of detrimentally disturbed soils.	Y
					39	The Forest Service utilizes a proxy—detrimental disturbance—rather than more direct measures of management-induced losses or reductions of soil productivity.	N
					40	We are aware of no scientific information based upon KNF data that correlates the proxy (areal extent of detrimental soil disturbance in activity areas) to metrics of long-term reductions in soil productivity in activity areas, in order to validate the use of the proxy as a scientifically meaningful estimate of changes in soil productivity.	N
					41	FW-GDL-SOIL-01, 03, 04, and 05. It is unclear if the use of the word "should" is intended to recognize the second consistency requirement on page 4 of the LMP, or if it is intended to render these entire Guidelines to be discretionary, as courts have interpreted "should."	Y
					42	FW-GDL-SOIL-04. Activities on landslide-prone activities can always be avoided.	Y
					43	FW-OBJ-RIP-01. The wording of this objective (including "maintain or") renders it aimless.	N
					44	FW-STD-RIP-01, 02. The meaning of "intact and ...functioning at desired conditions" is unclear. There is no reference to any established objective criteria.	Y
					45	FW-STD-RIP-02. The last sentence is a vast loophole that allows this standard to be ignored in project development as long as the project documents make any claim that the project has some "large scale" restoration component.	Y
					46	FW-GDL-RIP-01, 02, 03, 04, and 05. It is unclear if the use of the word "should" is intended to recognize the second consistency requirement on page 4 of the LMP, or if it is intended to render these entire Guidelines to be discretionary, as courts have interpreted "should."	Y
					47	FW-STD-RIP-03. The LMP and FEIS fail to acknowledge the known limitations of the INFISH direction by supplementing it with sufficient other LMP Direction.	Y
					48	FW-OBJ-AQH-01. The Forest Service sets as an Aquatic Habitat restoration Objective for the next 15 years an inadequate length of stream channels, hardly addressing the LMP Goal for this topic.	Y
					49	36 CFR 219.27. NFMA regulations at 36 CFR 219.27(e) state: "No management practices causing detrimental changes in water temperature or	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
						chemical composition, blockages of water courses, or deposits of sediment shall be permitted within these areas which seriously and adversely affect water conditions or fish habitat." (Emphasis added.) The LMP does not contain direction that explicitly limits the <b>amount</b> of sediment that would be allowed to enter water bodies from management activities.	
					50	USDA, 2008 reveals the 1987 Forest Plan and the revised LMP are not in compliance with NFMA regulations. We also note that the LMP changes INFISH Standard RF-5 from a Standard to a more discretionary Guideline.	Y
					51	OBJECTION STATEMENT: Management Indicator Species. AWR comments included: The Plan does not include endangered & threatened species as management indicator species; ... bull trout should have been included on the list of MIS. The Plan does not include a management indicator species for other species ...with special habitat needs. ...The Forest Plan does not identify any commonly fished species or sensitive species; a common choice in this category is westslope cutthroat trout.	Y
					52	The LMP does not contain any requirement for the Forest Service to insure that its management activities will maintain viable populations of Sensitive species. The LMP does not even include a definition of viable population in its Glossary.	Y
					53	LMP does not contain any requirement for the Forest Service to insure that its management activities will maintain viable populations of Sensitive species. The LMP and FEIS do not even include a definition of viable population.	Y
					54	Unfortunately, the LMP takes a huge step backwards in regard to old growth. In apparently rejecting NFMA responsibilities for maintaining viable populations of native wildlife, the LMP drops all requirements to monitor the population trends of old-growth associated species.	Y
					55	Use of VMAP base data causes unacceptable inaccuracy in the wildlife analysis.	Y
					56	FW-DC-WL-01. This Desired Condition states, "Individual animals that establish nests and den sites near areas of pre-existing human use are assumed to be accepting of that existing level of human use at the time the animals establish occupancy." We are unaware of any scientific research that validates the inclusion of this blanket assumption for all wildlife.	Y
					57	FW-DC-WL-06. The provision directing management to promote large-diameter trees in eagle nesting territories is not based upon any information source from the KNF that demonstrates its need, or on recommendations of any scientific research on bald eagles, as far as we are aware.	N
					58	FW-OBJ-WL-01 What is the KNF definition for maintenance and restoration?	Y
					59	Forestwide Wildlife Guidelines: It is unclear if the use of the word "should" is intended to recognize the second consistency requirement on page 4 of the LMP, or if it is intended to render these entire Guidelines to be discretionary, as courts have interpreted "should."	Y
					60	FW-GDL-WL-01, 02, 08, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21. The words, "or minimize" are not objectively defined and threaten to nullify these guidelines.	N
					61	FW-GDL-WL-05. While in some ways the intent of this Guideline may be	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
						seen as protecting diversity, its wording can also be read to provide direction to log areas that scientific consensus recognizes as some of the worst places to do so, because of the ecological sensitivity and often rarity of such habitats.	
					62	FW-GDL-WL-10 Big Game. LMP has no numerical big game security standard, the Objective now stating "...subunits should maintain existing levels of security..."	Y
					63	FW-GDL-WL-16. This Desired Condition states, "(Raptors) that establish nests near pre-existing human activities are assumed to be tolerant of that level of activity." We are unaware of any scientific research that validates the inclusion of this assumption for all raptors.	Y
					64	FW-GDL-WL-21. This Desired Condition states, "Individual animals that establish nests and den sites near areas of pre-existing human use... are assumed to be accepting..." We are unaware of any scientific research that validates the inclusion of this assumption for the remaining species "not covered under other forestwide guidelines."	Y
					65	Landscape Connectivity. AWR comments voiced support for establishing a Management Area 8: Wildlife Linkage Zones	Y
					66	Inadequate direction to designate the minimum road system.	Y
					67	FW-DC-AR-04. This Desired Condition is a forest plan decision that prioritizes vast but unspecified acreages of the KNF for motorized recreation, in the absence of the travel planning required by regulation to be completed in 2015.	N
					68	FW-OBJ-AR-04. This Objective is a forest plan decision that designate unspecified mileages of the KNF for motorized recreation, in the absence of the travel planning required by regulation to be completed in 2015.	N
					69	Road Density. Outside of grizzly bear habitat specified by the Access Amendment, the LMP has no road density standards.	Y
					70	Special Areas. AWR's comments noted that, the 2006 KIPZ Draft Comprehensive Evaluation Report (2006 CER) contained many more special areas than the draft LMP recommended.	Y
					71	FW-GDL-IRA-01. This Guideline implies direction to the Forest Service to remove (or at least allow degradation of) Wilderness potential on 84% of the inventoried roadless areas on the Forest. Because Wilderness is a nonrenewable resource, there must be no more loss of Wilderness potential.	Y
					72	The range of alternatives is inadequate with respect to wilderness evaluation.	Y
					73	Roadless inventory/boundaries. It is often the case that specific areas have been omitted from inventoried roadless areas, especially those immediately adjacent to IRAs, which have no disqualifying features.	N
					74	FW-DC-TBR-01. Including the sentence that begins with "Salvage..." perpetuates the longstanding conflict between timber production and natural processes that create wildlife habitat. The Desired Condition also includes the vague phrase, "associated desired conditions." And the Desired Condition fails to recognize that, for decades, market demand has conflicted with ecological sustainability.	N
					75	FW-DC-TBR-03: Logging in unsuitable acreage. The wording reinforces the	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
						fact that "timber cutting" will likely occur in roadless areas not recommended for wilderness.	
					76	FW-DC-TBR-04. The Allowable Sale Quantity (ASQ) of 80.2 – 90 million board feet annually is not based upon scientifically sound modeling that adequately considers ecological and economic constraints. It creates a sense of false expectations for forest products industries. It is simply not ecologically sustainable.	N
					77	FW-OBJ-TBR-01. Any timber target provides incentives which conflict with ecological sustainability. The annual target of offering 47.5 million board feet for sale is not based upon scientifically sound modeling that adequately considers ecological and economic constraints. It creates a sense of false expectations for forest products industries. It is simply not ecologically sustainable.	N
					78	W-STD-TBR-02. This highlights a problem we've long noted, there being an undefined category of natural processes the Forest Service calls "catastrophe", which has generally translates to dead trees not being logged (not maximizing timber volume produced) as the catastrophe rather than there really being something truly ecologically harmful.	N
					79	FW-GDL-TBR-01 and MA6-STD-TBR-01. Together with the wording of FW-DC-TBR-03, this Guideline and Standard essentially nullify any meaningful distinction between suitable and unsuitable land, and together with timber targets (FW-OBJ-TBR-01) and the ASQ (FW-DC-TBR-04), encourages logging in unsuitable land.	Y
					80	FW-DC-GRZ-03. Closing allotments can only increase the ecological integrity and economic efficiency of Forest management.	N
					81	FW-DC-SES-04. This Desired Condition risks perpetuating the Smoky Bear myth that protection from fire is a promise that the government can and should make.	N
					82	In recognition of the critical challenge posed by climate change to global ecosystems as well as the KNF, AWR comments listed scientific research and opinion identifying forest management as a contributor to climate change. The FEIS dismisses it without addressing the substance of that science.	Y
					83	The LMP's Monitoring Program is inadequate for informing the agency and the public within any valid adaptive management framework.	Y
					84	MON-VEG-01-01. Since the LMP has no valid, scientifically based metrics forming a definition of a stand that is resilient, resistant, meeting Desired Conditions, etc. it will always be cloaked in "profess	Y
					85	Indicator MON-VEG-01-02 merely reports on acres burned, and lacks any qualitative component.	Y
					86	The LMP's monitoring of old growth also would be potentially not useful.	Y
					87	Indicator MON-VEG-01-05, the annual measure of old growth and recruitment potential old growth, does not require that the old-growth definition as specified in the LMP Glossary be the measurement criteria utilized to determine if any acre is old growth.	Y
					88	The logic behind Indicator MON-VEG-01-06 is obscure, since annually determining old-growth acres "treated" would reveal nothing about the	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
						outcome—positive or negative—of those treatments.	
					89	The Indicator MON-VEG-01-07 is a measure of the numbers of dead trees per acre on the KNF and itself lacks any relevance to resources.	Y
					90	The Indicator MON-VEG-01-08 lacks relevance since it would merely measure the "Number of acres influenced by insects and disease."	Y
					91	The logic behind Indicator MON-VEG-02-01 is obscure, since annually determining acres of noxious weeds "treated" might reveal nothing about the effectiveness of those treatments.	Y
					92	The logic behind Indicator MON-VEG-02-02 is obscure.	Y
					93	Indicator MON-FIRE-01-01. Effectiveness of fuel treatments is not evaluated.	Y
					94	Indicator MON-FIRE-02-01. There is nothing ecological about this indicator, since there is no spatial measure (acres burned that meet positive ecological outcomes.)	Y
					95	Indicator MON-WTR-01-01. "Number of Best Management Practices..." . This Indicator is too vague to answer the Monitoring Question, "Are soil, water quality, and riparian and aquatic habitats protected and moving towards desired conditions?"	Y
					96	Indicators MON-WTR-02-01, 02. It is unclear how measuring watersheds by "miles of restoration activities" would be useful.	Y
					97	The monitoring program sorely lacks a focus on Water Quality Limited Segments and meeting state defined beneficial uses.	Y
					98	The Watershed Disturbance Rating strongly suggests forestwide direction to attain watershed restoration. There are no correlations of the Watershed Condition Rating or Watershed Disturbance Rating with other measures, such as the condition or status of aquatic habitat such as attainment of INFISH RMOs, with measures of hydrological equilibrium/streambank stability in assessed subwatersheds, or with data gathered for the 1987 Plan monitoring items.	Y
					99	Indicator MON-AQH-01-01. Good start, however it lacks a baseline of unconnected stream habitat for subsequent comparison.	Y
					100	The monitoring program lacks Monitoring Questions and Indicators for the Sensitive westslope cutthroat trout, inland redband trout, and western pearlshell mussel. This is necessary because monitoring elements for bull trout would not extend to large numbers of watersheds where the former inhabit.	Y
					101	The LMP provides no information regarding which instream and biotic attributes and what instream and channel parameters will be monitored and measured, or how they will be summarized, to determine whether KNF watersheds are trending toward desired conditions.	Y
					102	The Monitoring Program lacks a measure for determining significant reductions in soil productivity due to land management activities in any timeframe short of forever. There is a lack of any measure of the areal extent of soil damage within any geographic scale.	Y
					103	There is no monitoring of the accomplishment of soil restoration.	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
					104	Monitoring Question MON-FLS-01. This is worded too vaguely to provide meaningful answers.	Y
					105	Indicator MON-FLS-01-02. These parameters must be reported annually, however a measure of population numbers of Canada lynx is essential for determining attainment of recovery, as is information on trapping mortality. 14	Y
					106	Indicator MON-FLS-01-03. Specific to the INFISH monitoring requirements that this Indicator adopts; since at age 18 years INFISH has long ago become more than "interim" the logical requirement is that the KNF must use monitoring data to determining if project implementation results in attainment of riparian goals and objectives—deemed to be "critical" monitoring by the Forest Service in Appendix B.	Y
					107	Monitoring Indicator MON-MIS-01-01. This lacks a requirement to estimate baseline population numbers, and measure population trends in response to management actions.	Y
					108	Monitoring Indicator MON-MIS-01-02. Nothing is required specific to any bird species, rendering it useless as a biological indicator. Also, both a) and b) are completely redundant with above inadequate Monitoring Indicators.	Y
					109	The KNF dropped monitoring for Sensitive species from the LMP.	Y
					110	Indicator MON-MIS-01-03. This relies upon a measurement system that is not explained anywhere in the LMP. It merely commits to monitoring "changes" in the parameter, measured vaguely somewhere every five years.	Y
					111	Indicator MON-WDL-01-01. Nothing is required specific to any wildlife species, rendering it useless as a biological indicator. It is also highly redundant with above inadequate Monitoring Indicators. It is also unclear how measuring "acres of habitat restored or enhanced" would be useful since the definition of restoration in the LMP and in NEPA documents is so lax that every acre treated would be considered restored or enhanced.	Y
					112	Monitoring Question MON-AR-01. With the wide variety recreation impacts on the wide variety of recreation sites throughout Forest, there is a need for more specific monitoring and reporting.	Y
					113	Monitoring Question MON-AR-02. Identification of the minimum transportation system necessary is a regulatory requirement, so the KNF must complete forestwide travel planning in 2015.	Y
					114	Monitoring Question MON-AR-03. Specific to motorized recreation, once again identification of the minimum transportation system necessary is a regulatory requirement, and the KNF must complete its forestwide travel planning in 2015.	Y
					115	Monitoring Question MON-WLDN-01. The KNF has so many acres of roadless areas that deserve protection as Wilderness. The public would be well-served with a Monitoring Question and Indicators that assess wilderness conditions and trends in roadless areas.	Y
					116	Indicator MON-MIN-01-01. Good start, however the baseline number of unreclaimed abandoned mine sites must be disclosed. Additionally, including	Y
					117	Monitoring Question MON-SOC-01. Data on the contribution to the economy from those gathering non-timber products, hunters, anglers, and	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
						recreationists would lead to a more balanced understanding by the agency of how the Forest sustains local and regional economies.	
14-13-00-0027	257	Beardslee	Greg	Montana Mountain Bike Alliance	1	Statement of issues and/or parts of the plan revision which the objection applies: I object to the fact that Kootenai National Forest, under direction from Region 1 of the USDA Forest Service, has adopted a policy for the management of Recommended Wilderness management areas that has not been properly assessed through the National Environmental Policy Act.	Y
					2	We object to the proposal to manage the northern portion of the Whitefish Divide area as MA 1B – Recommended Wilderness.	Y
					3	I object to the fact that Kootenai National Forest, under direction from Region 1 of the USDA Forest Service, has recommended wilderness in the Galton Area, which does not match the recommendations of the Galton Community Collaborative.	Y
14-13-00-0029	175	Gwynn	Butch		1	I object to the proposal to manage the northern portion of the Whitefish Divide area as MA 1B – Recommended Wilderness.	Y
					2	I object to the KNF's proposal to manage portions of the town of Eureka's municipal watershed as MA1b – Recommended Wilderness.	Y
					3	I object to the fact that KNF, under direction from Region 1 of the USDA Forest Service, has adopted a policy for the management of Recommended Wilderness management areas that has not been properly assessed through the National Environmental Policy Act.	Y
					4	I object to the process and protocol which were utilized to designate Inventory Roadless Areas (IRA's) in Region 1 of the Forest Service, and on the KNF. I also object to the evaluation process for wilderness characteristics applied to the IRA's currently designated on the KNF.	Y
					5	I object to the proposal to manage the area within the Whitefish Divide area from Williams Creek south to the KNF forest boundary and east to the KNF forest boundary as MA 5a -Backcountry non-motorized year round.	Y
14-13-00-0030	236	Colburn	Kevin	National Stewardship Director American Whitewater	1	The specific streams that we assert were wrongly found ineligible are Callahan Creek, Granite Creek, Grave Creek, Libby Creek, Quartz Creek, Rock Creek, Ross Creek, Star Creek, Swamp Creek, and the Wigwam River.	Y
14-13-00-0032	301/255	Peck	Brian	Natural Resources Defense Council	1	The overarching theme of the Plan would create a Forest with little commitment to Inventoried Roadless Areas, Wilderness, wildlife security, or habitat connectivity and too permissive of roads, logging, and motorized/mechanized use of landscapes (winter and summer).	Y
					2	The Northern Region's Wilderness Evaluation Process based upon Capability, Availability, and Need (CAN) flatly ignores the intent of Congress in the 1964 Wilderness Act; is subjective and biased; and willfully substitutes manager preferences and human recreational "wants" for ecological "needs."	Y
					3	Despite the Kootenai National Forest's key role on the Cabinet-Yaak/Selkirk Grizzly Bear Subcommittee and IGBC Linkage Taskforce, the Final Forest Plan and FEIS fail to provide the habitat connectivity and home range security vital to recovering grizzlies in this ecosystem and the Lower 48 states.	Y
					4	Despite the well-known requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Forest Plan and FEIS fail to provide a reasonable range of	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
						alternatives.	
					5	It appears that the Forest Plan and FEIS would sanction logging and roading in IRA's in violation of the 2001 Roadless Rule. In addition, such proposals would further stress a Kootenai Forest budget already incapable of maintaining the current road system.	Y
14-13-00-0034	353	Raines	McKinley		1	I object to the fact that the KNF provided no alternatives to the forest plan revision which offered less restrictive forest management policies with respect to forest access, recreation, and vegetation management.	Y
					2	I object to the KNF forest plan revision on the basis that the economic analysis was inadequate in its assessment of the economic impacts the management policies proposed in the preferred alternative with have on the rural communities in Lincoln and Sanders counties. In addition, I object to the KNF plan revision because I believe that the management policies proposed in the plan are in direct violation of Executive Order #13575.	Y in part
					3	I object to the KNF forest plan revision proposals to manage lands as MA1b – Recommended Wilderness and MA5a – Backcountry non-motorized year long.	Y
					4	I object to the KNF forest plan revision proposals to reduce recreational access and limit vegetation management options in the name of fish and wildlife species currently listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act.	Y
					5	Object to designation of eligible wild and scenic rivers	Y
					6	I object to the KNFs current travel management policies, and forest plan revision proposals which restrict motorized access to national forest lands without sufficiently supporting those restrictions with credible, accepted science.	Y
					7	I object to the lack of forest vegetation management proposed with respect to currently existing timber stands which are in desperate need of either commercial or pre-commercial thinning, especially those stands which exist at over 4000 feet elevation.	Y
					8	I object to the current and proposed KNF forest management with respect to Old Growth.	Y
14-13-00-0035	335	Curtiss	Steve	Chairman Glen Lake Irrigation District	1	We object to the proposal to manage the northern portion of the Whitefish Divide area as MA 1B – Recommended Wilderness.	Y
					2	We object to the proposal to manage Big Creek, Little North Fork Big Creek, Good Creek, North Fork Big Creek, Copeland Creek, Drop Creek, South Fork Big Creek, East Branch of South Fork Big Creek, West Branch of South Fork Big Creek, Yaak River, West Fork Yaak River, Vinal Creek, Bull River, North Fork Bull River, Middle Fork Bull River, Bighorn Creek, East Fork Bull River, and Vermillion River as Management Area 2 – Eligible Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers.	Y
					3	We object to the fact that the KNF did not consider all county plans as the planning process developed, and did not sufficiently consider the input provided by Glen Lake Irrigation District (GLID), when formulating the KNF Revised Plan.	Y
					4	We object to the KNF's proposal to manage portions of the town of Eureka's	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
						municipal watershed as MA1b – Recommended Wilderness.	
					5	We object to the fact that Kootenai National Forest, under direction from Region 1 of the USDA Forest Service, has adopted a policy to manage Recommended Wilderness management areas as if they were congressionally designated wilderness, despite the fact that the public has not had sufficient opportunity to comment on this policy, and this policy has not been approved by the Congress of the United States, the only official body legally designate wilderness.	Y
					6	We object to the process and protocol which were utilized to designate Inventory Roadless Areas (IRA's) in Region 1 of the Forest Service, and on the KNF. We also object to the evaluation process for wilderness characteristics applied to the IRA's currently designated on the KNF.	Y
					7	We object to the proposal to manage the area within the Whitefish Divide area from Williams Creek south to the KNF forest boundary and east to the KNF forest boundary as MA 5a - Backcountry non-motorized year round.	Y
					8	We object to forest management proposals within the Kootenai National Forest Plan which violate the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960 (P.L. 86-517, 74 Stat.215), and/or the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of October 21, 1976 (P.L. 94-579,90 Stat. 2742, as amended)	N
					9	We object to the KNF's proposal to designate 36 additional special areas (MA 3), totaling 30,635 acres, and three additional research natural areas (MA 4), totaling 3,226 acres. We also object to the proposal to increase the size of the Northwest Peaks, and Ten Lakes, scenic areas.	Y
					10	We object to the assertion that the KNF utilized the "Best Available Science" throughout the plan revision process.	Y
					11	We object to the management policies proposed in the name of species currently listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act including; Grizzly Bears and Canada Lynx.	Y
14-13-00-0037	212	Aitken, Jr	Gary	Chairman Kootenai Tribe of Idaho	1	Based on our review, it appears that the ERG report had limited internal USFS biological review (i.e., gaps in explanations and apparent discrepancies between the report and the Final EIS).	Y
					2	It is imperative that the Forests inventory, evaluate, analyze and determine recommended wilderness in a fully transparent manner. The Kootenai Tribe believes the Forests failed to do so in the final Plans and recommends additional dialogue and discussion with the Tribe and affected communities on this issue.	Y
14-13-00-0038	154, 299, 300	Hadden	Dave	Executive Director Headwaters Montana	1	The Plan improperly assesses the Wigwam River and Grave creeks from consideration as eligible wild and scenic rivers claiming other administrative designations and insufficient ORVs preclude a recommendation in violation of their responsibility to fairly assess eligibility	Y
14-13-00-0039	312	Trochmann	John	Chairman Sanders Natural Resource Council	1	KNF Forest management proposals are in violation of Executive Order #13575, dated June 13, 2011.	Y
					2	We object to placing any part of the Kootenai River into the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. We also object to the proposal to manage Bull River, North Fork Bull River, Middle Fork Bull River, East Fork Bull River, Vermillion River, Big Creek, Little North Fork Big Creek, Good Creek, North Fork Big Creek,	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
						Copeland Creek, Drop Creek, South Fork Big Creek, East Branch of South Fork Big Creek, West Branch of South Fork Big Creek, Vinal Creek, Bighorn Creek, Yaak River, and West Fork Yaak River as Management Area 2 – Eligible Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers.	
					3	We object to forest management proposals within the Kootenai National Forest Plan which violate the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960 (P.L. 86-517, 74 Stat.215), and/or the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of October 21, 1976 (P.L. 94-579,90 Stat. 2742, as amended)	N
					4	We object to the wilderness proposal for management of the Scotchman Peaks, Roderick, and lands adjacent to the existing Cabinet Mountain Wilderness Area as MA 1b – Recommended Wilderness.	Y
					5	We object to the adoption of the "Forest Plan Amendments for Motorized Access Management within the Selkirk and Cabinet-Yaak Grizzly Bear Recovery Zones" Record of Decision (with its road closures and road density standards intended to protect grizzly bears) into the Kootenai Forest Plan.	Y
<b>14-13-00-0040</b>	MWA - 338; WS - 247; Headwaters 154, 299, 300	Gatchell	John	Conservation Director Montana Wilderness Association	1	Substandard wilderness assessment results in biased and unlawful wilderness recommendations; the KNF's approach to wilderness overall is limited by an arbitrary ceiling.	Y
					2	The draft ROD arbitrarily removes from recommended wilderness the Krag-Krinklehorn-Krag Peaks region of the Thompson-Seton IRA and the Kootenai NF side of the Tuchuck IRA and proposed wilderness along the Whitefish Divide, bordering the Trail Creek Grizzly Management Area, on the Flathead National Forest.	Y
					3	The draft ROD proposes to reclassify wild lands adjoining and near the Cabinet Mountains Wilderness from MA 2 Non-Motorized to 5b Motorized.	Y
					4	The Forest Service based its decision not to recommend the Ten Lakes WSA for wilderness on impermissible grounds	Y
<b>14-13-00-0041</b>	New issue	Vincent	Chas		1	We object to the fact that KNF, under direction from Region 1 of the USDA Forest Service, has adopted a policy to manage Recommended Wilderness management areas as if they were congressionally designated wilderness, despite the fact that the public has not had sufficient opportunity to comment on this policy, and this policy has not been approved by the Congress of the United States, the only official body legally designate wilderness.	N
<b>14-13-00-0043</b>	15	Cox	Donald		1	We object to forest management proposals within the Kootenai National Forest Plan which violate the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960 (P.L. 86-517, 74 Stat.215), and/or the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of October 21, 1976 (P.L. 94-579,90 Stat. 2742, as amended)	N
<b>14-13-00-0046</b>	321	Petersen	Mike	The Lands Council	1	The Plan does not include those monitoring components required under 36 CFR 219(k)(4)	Y
					2	The Plan's lack of Standards and use of non-binding Guidelines are too discretionary to ensure that they will be accomplished.	Y
					3	The Plan relies upon achieving its vegetation direction as a surrogate for restoring wildlife habitat.	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
					4	There are no standards in the Plan that guarantee that the Desired Condition, which states that an increase in old growth is desirable, will be accomplished.	Y
					5	We think the loss of snags continues to be a problem and that by not taking the opportunity for education, including signage, permit conditions, etc. snags will continue to be lost along roadways throughout the Forest.	Y
					6	In order to meet NFMA direction and manage National Forest System lands without permanent impairment, the policy of the Forest Service Northern Region is to "...not create detrimental soil conditions on more than 15 percent of an activity area" (FSM 2554.03). This is only referred to in the FEIS as being one of the laws, but its importance is such that it merits specific mention.	Y
					7	While we see that vegetation will be monitored, we remain concerned that wildlife, watershed recovery, old growth recruitment, soil productivity, snags, and noxious weeds are not monitored in a way that will indicate movement towards Desired Condition.	Y
					8	We asked that the Plan address the many specific problems in the 1998 Bull Trout BiOp that was discussed in the draft plan, but cannot see a response to our concerns.	Y
					9	We are strongly concerned that the Plan fails to reflect the KNF duty to right-size the road system by deferring to project level analysis.	Y
14-13-00-0047	20	McCully	Marc		1	We object to the process and protocol which were utilized to designate Inventory Roadless Areas (IRA's) in Region 1 of the Forest Service, and on the KNF. We also object to the evaluation process for wilderness characteristics applied to the IRA's currently designated on the KNF.	Y
14-13-00-0048	Scoping 3/2010; 154, 299, 300	Nelson	Peter	Senior Policy Advisor for Federal Lands Defenders of Wildlife	1	The KNF final revised land management plan and Draft Record of Decision (ROD) fails to adequately identify, quantify, or propose management standards and guidelines for wildlife corridors and linkage zones within the KNF and adjacent jurisdictions, including to Canada, the Flathead National Forest, Idaho Panhandle National Forest, and Lolo National Forest.	Y
14-13-00-0050	332/362	Cuffe	Mike	Representative House District 2	1	The USFS is biased towards favoring hands off management. I see no need to create additional Wilderness Area, especially when proposed areas don't meet established criteria based on size, prior usage, description and location.	Y
14-13-00-0051	263	Hinkle	Greg		1	KNF Forest management proposals do not have a clear, concise confirmation of the number of Grizzly Bears inhabiting the area of the KNF. The KNF EIS and draft Record of Decision, Grizzly Bear Amendment has not taken into consideration yet to be announced results of the Grizzly Bear hair snag sample tests (DNA) conducted by the US Geological Survey.	Y
14-13-00-0053	245	Wandler	Jerry	Troy & Libby Snowmobile Clubs	1	Boundary adjustments for Scotchman Peaks.	Y
14-13-00-0056	110	Vogleman	Dave		1	I object to the proposal to manage the northern portion of the Whitefish Divide area as MA1b- Recommended Wilderness.	Y
					2	I object to the KNF's proposal to manage portions of the town of Eureka's municipal watershed as MA1b - Recommended Wilderness.	Y
					3	I object to the fact that Kootenai National Forest, under direction from Region 1 of the USDA Forest Service, has adopted a policy for the management of Recommended Wilderness management areas that has not	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
						been properly assessed through the National Environmental Policy Act.	
					4	I object to the process and protocol which were utilized to designate Inventory Roadless Areas (IRA's) in Region 1 of the Forest Service, and on the KNF. I also object to the evaluation process for wilderness characteristics applied to the IRA's currently designated on the KNF.	Y
					5	I object to the proposal to manage the area within the Whitefish Divide area from Williams Creek south to the KNF forest boundary and east to the KNF forest boundary as MA 5a- Backcountry non-motorized year round.	Y
14-13-00-0057	109	Mason	Gary		1	I object to the proposal to manage the northern portion of the Whitefish Divide area as MA 1B- Recommended Wilderness.	Y
					2	I object to the KNF's proposal to manage portions of the town of Eureka's municipal watershed as MA1b - Recommended Wilderness.	Y
					3	I object to the fact that Kootenai National Forest, under direction from Region 1 of the USDA Forest Service, has adopted a policy for the management of Recommended Wilderness management areas that has not been properly assessed through the National Environmental Policy Act.	Y
					4	I object to the process and protocol which were utilized to designate Inventory Roadless Areas (IRA's) in Region 1 of the Forest Service, and on the KNF. I also object to the evaluation process for wilderness characteristics applied to the IRA's currently designated on the KNF.	Y
					5	I object to the proposal to manage the area within the Whitefish Divide area from Williams Creek south to the KNF forest boundary and east to the KNF forest boundary as MA 5a- Backcountry non-motorized year round.	Y
14-13-00-0058	363	West	Kurt		1	My objection is in regard to Thompson Seton recommended Wilderness.	Y
					2	I object to more restrictive management that consolidates and restricts recognized recreational use.	Y
					3	I object to 5a management in the Whitefish Divide area.	Y
					4	I object to the ROS modeling that was used on the Kootenai National Forest Plan.	N
					5	Objection process in general; failure to meet NEPA requirements.	Y
14-13-00-0059	293/324	Matthesis	Scott	President Montanans for Multiple Use - North Lincoln County Chapter	1	We object to the reductions in motorized forest access and recreation opportunities on the KNF that will result from the implementation of Alternative B modified.	Y
					2	We object to forest management proposals within the Kootenai National Forest Plan which violate Executive Order #13575, dated June 13, 2011.	Y
					3	We object to the process and protocol which were utilized to designate Inventory Roadless Areas (IRA's) in Region 1 of the Forest Service, and on the KNF. We also object to the evaluation process for wilderness characteristics applied to the IRA's currently designated on the KNF.	Y
					4	We object to forest management proposals within the Kootenai National Forest Plan which violate the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960 (P.L. 86-517, 74 Stat.215), and/or the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of October 21, 1976 (P.L. 94-579,90 Stat. 2742, as amended)	Y
14-13-00-0060	386	Baney	Scott		1	I object to the proposal to manage the area within the Whitefish Divide area	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
						from Williams Creek south to the KNF forest boundary and east to the KNF forest boundary as MA 5a - Backcountry non-motorized year round.	
					2	I object to the process and protocol which were utilized to designate Inventory Road less Areas (IRA's) in Region 1 of the Forest Service, and on the KNF. I also object to the evaluation process for wilderness characteristics applied to the IRA's currently designated on the KNF.	Y
					3	I object to the fact that Kootenai National Forest, under direction from Region 1 of the USDA Forest Service, has adopted a policy for the management of Recommended Wilderness management areas that has not been properly assessed through the National Environmental Policy Act.	Y
					4	I object to the KNF's proposal to manage portions of the town of Eureka's municipal watershed as MA1b- Recommended Wilderness.	Y
					5	I object to the proposal to manage the northern portion of the Whitefish Divide area as MA 1b- Recommended Wilderness.	Y
14-13-00-0061	357	White	Kerry	Citizens for Balanced Use	1	I object to the fact that Kootenai National Forest, under direction from Region 1 of the USDA Forest Service, has adopted a policy for the management of Recommended Wilderness management areas that has not been properly assessed through the National Environmental Policy Act.	Y
					2	CBU objects to the Kootenai Land Management Plan FEIS in its violation of E0#13575	Y
14-13-00-0063	314	Letcher	Josh		1	I object to the proposal to manage the area within the Whitefish Divide area from Williams Creek south to the KNF forest boundary and east to the KNF forest boundary as MA 5a- Backcountry non-motorized year round.	Y
					2	I object to the process and protocol which were utilized to designate Inventory Road less Areas (IRA's) in Region 1 of the Forest Service, and on the KNF. I also object to the evaluation process for wilderness characteristics applied to the IRA's currently designated on the KNF.	Y
					3	I object to the fact that Kootenai National Forest, under direction from Region 1 of the USDA Forest Service, has adopted a policy for the management of Recommended Wilderness management areas that has not been properly assessed through the National Environmental Policy Act.	Y
					4	I object to the KNF's proposal to manage portions of the town of Eureka's municipal watershed as MA1b - Recommended Wilderness and MA5a -Back Country Non-motorized.	Y
					5	I object to the proposal to manage the northern portion of the Whitefish Divide area as MA 1b- Recommended Wilderness.	Y
					6	I object to the proposal to manage Big Creek, Little North Fork Big Creek, Good Creek, North Fork Big Creek, Copeland Creek, Drop Creek, South Fork Big Creek, East Branch of South Fork Big Creek, West Branch of South Fork Big Creek, Yaak River, West Fork Yaak River, Vinal Creek, Bull River, North Fork Bull River, Middle Fork Bull River, Bighorn Creek, East Fork Bull River, and Vermillion River as Management Area 2-Eligible Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers. I also object to KNF personnel using the boundaries of the KNF in the eligibility portion of the analysis process.	Y
					7	I object to the proposal to manage portions of the Whitefish Divide, Roderick, Scotchman's Peak, and lands adjacent to the existing Cabinet Mountain Wilderness Area as MA 1b- Recommended Wilderness.	Y

OBJ. #	CL #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	Issue #	Issue	STDG
14-13-00-0065	29	Powers	Mike		1	I object to the proposal to manage the Roderick, Scotchman's Peak, and lands adjacent to the existing Cabinet Mountain Wilderness Area as MA 1b - Recommended Wilderness.	Y
14-13-00-0066	132	Fields	Edwin		1	I object to the proposed management of the Cabinet Mountains and surrounding area as it pertains to grizzly bear recovery.	Y
					2	I object to the promoting of mining activity and road building for non-existent mines on the plan where mining activity has not been applied for.	Y
					3	I object to about 85% of the KNF being open to snowmobiling.	Y
					4	I strongly object and caution that your management of the Ten Lakes WSA will lead to lawsuits.	Y
					5	I object to the marginalization of wilderness advocacy stakeholders by the Forest Service	Y
14-13-00-0067	268	Crowe Costello	Mary	Executive Director Rock Creek Alliance		Grizzly bear habitat in and around the Cabinet Mountains Wilderness area.	Y