



**BARK**  
 PO Box 12065  
 Portland, OR 97212  
 503-331-0374  
 Bark@SpiritOne.com  
 www.Bark-out.org

**APPEAL TO THE REGIONAL FORESTER  
 OF THE UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE  
 REGION 6**

BARK,	)
	)
	) <u>36 CFR § 215 Appeal</u>
	)
	) In Re: Appeal of the
	) Decision
APPELLANT	) Memo for the <b>No Whisky</b>
	) <b>Plantation Thinning</b>
	)
	)
	) vs
GARY LARSEN, FOREST SUPERVISOR,	)
DECIDING OFFICER.	)
	)
	)

---

APPELLANT’S: NOTICE OF APPEAL, REQUEST FOR STAY, REQUESTED RELIEF,  
 AND STATEMENT OF REASONS

Dated this 1st day of June, 2006

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

To: Appeal Deciding Officer  
 Linda Goodman, Regional Forester  
 ATTN: 1570 Appeals  
 PO Box 2623  
 Portland, OR 97208-6323

Emailed to: appeals-pacificnorthwest-regional-office@fs.fed.us

Dear Ms. Goodman,

In accordance with 36 CFR 215, Bark hereby appeals the Decision Notice for the No Whisky Plantation Thinning (“No Whisky”) signed by the Mt. Hood National Forest (“MHNF”) Forest Supervisor Gary Larsen on April 17th, 2006.

Decision Document: No Whisky Decision Notice

Decision Date: April 17, 2006

Responsible Official: Linda Goodman, Regional Forester

Appeal Period End Date: June 1, 2006.

Description of the Project: The Proposed Action would log 1678 acres of forest, including 45 riparian reserve acres, and construct 1.5 miles of new “temporary” roads.

Location: Mostly within the North Fork Clackamas watershed, in the Clackamas Ranger District. Some of the project is contained in the Lower Clackamas River watershed, Clackamas Ranger District. The project area is located in T4S, R5E; T4S, R6E; Willamette Meridian.

Appellant’s Interests:

Bark has a specific interest in this sale, and that interest will be adversely affected by this timber sale. We have previously expressed our interest in this specific sale, and have standing to appeal this decision according to 36 CFR § 215.11 (a)(2). Bark is a non-profit organization based in Portland, Oregon and has worked to protect the Mt. Hood National Forest since 1999. Members and staff of Bark live in the communities surrounding the Mt. Hood National Forest and use the Forest extensively for recreation, viewing wildlife and wildflowers, municipal water, hunting, fishing, overall aesthetic enjoyment, and other purposes. Specifically, members and/or staff of Bark have used the No Whisky project area for naturalist studies and hikes, but also as a key access point to recreation destinations such as Squaw Butte, the Salmon-Huckleberry Wilderness Area, and the Roaring River roadless area. The value of the activities engaged in by Bark members and staff will be irreparably damaged by this project. We have a long-standing interest in the sound management of this area, and the right to request agency compliance with applicable environmental laws.

**REQUEST FOR STAY**

Although an automatic stay is in effect for this sale as per 36 CFR 215.10(b), we formally request a stay of **all** action on this project, including sale preparation, layout, road planning, any advertising, offering for bids, auctioning, logging, road construction, or other site preparation by a purchaser pending the final decision on this appeal.

A full stay is essential to prevent unnecessary expenditure of taxpayers’ money, an irretrievable

commitment of agency resources, and irreversible environmental damage. Without a stay, the federal government may waste taxpayer money preparing a sale that may later be cancelled. Because we might pursue a legal challenge to this sale with or without this stay, offering this timber sale may unnecessarily expose the government to liability and the purchaser to financial losses.

## **REQUESTED RELIEF**

1. Withdraw the Decision Notice and/or prepare an adequate supplemental Environmental Assessment that complies with the National Environmental Policy Act; or
2. Modify the sale to address the following concerns:
  - a. Unit 1: Remove this unit from the Decision. Road 4610-011 is already showing signs of OHV abuse and the new road construction and thinning associated with Unit 1 will provide new vectors for OHV abuse.
  - b. Unit 2: Provide 30ft. no-cut buffers along boundaries adjacent to existing roads, yard trees from Rd 4610-112, scarify and revegetate -112 upon completion, add a berm and ditch (and boulders if available) at beginning of road, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce the road closure. Associated actions: Deconstruct road 4610-012 and close, revegetate and restore “high impact OHV areas” as identified by the map contained in the No Whisky EA Appendix E p17. Provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce OHV closure.
  - c. Unit 3: Provide 30ft. no-cut buffers along boundaries adjacent to Rd 4610, mitigate yarding corridors through the use of the narrowest possible corridor widths, revegetate upon completion, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce laws limiting OHV abuse. Associated action: deconstruct road 4610-113. Associated actions: Close, revegetate and restore “high impact OHV areas” as identified by the map contained in the No Whisky EA Appendix E p17. Provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce OHV closure.
  - d. Unit 4: Remove this unit from the Decision. This unit is exceptionally steep, has a high density of riparian areas, a higher density of snags than other units, is economically marginal due to proposed skyline yarding methods, and contains an active landslide just outside of the unit which terminates in N. Fork and may be exacerbated by logging.
  - e. Unit 5: The creek identified on the No Whisky Thinning Map from the EA shows a creek running along the eastern boundary of Unit 4 but terminating at the NW border of Unit 5. Bark field trips discovered this creek to flow seasonally through Unit 5 due south to a culvert located in Rd 4610. The intersection of Rd 4610 and Rd 4610-112 is a known OHV staging area, and is ripe for OHV abuse (see map identifying OHV high impact areas at No Whisky EA p 18). Therefore, we request that the intermittent stream course identified above be buffered with a 50ft no-cut buffer and that the portion of Unit 5 west of that stream course be removed from the Decision. Associated actions: Close, revegetate and restore “high impact OHV areas” as identified by the map contained in the No Whisky EA Appendix E

- p18. Provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce OHV closure.
- f. Unit 6: Provide 30ft. no-cut buffers along boundaries adjacent to Rd 4610 and Rd 4610-014. Yard trees from Rd 4610-014 to decrease exposure to OHV abuse already occurring on Rd 4610. Mitigate yarding corridors through the use of the narrowest possible corridor widths, revegetate upon completion, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce laws limiting OHV abuse.
  - g. Unit 7: Provide 30ft. no-cut buffers along boundaries adjacent to Rd 4610-014, mitigate yarding corridors through the use of the narrowest possible corridor widths, revegetate upon completion, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce laws limiting OHV abuse.
  - h. Unit 8: Provide 30ft. no-cut buffers along boundaries adjacent to Rd 4610-016, mitigate yarding corridors through the use of the narrowest possible corridor widths, revegetate upon completion, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce laws limiting OHV abuse. Associated action: deconstruct road 4610-017.
  - i. Unit 9: Provide 30ft. no-cut buffers along boundaries adjacent to Rd 4610 and Rd 4610, mitigate yarding corridors through the use of the narrowest possible corridor widths, revegetate upon completion, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce laws limiting OHV abuse.
  - j. Unit 10: Provide 30ft. no-cut buffers along boundaries adjacent to Rd 4610. Yard trees from new temporary road to minimize vegetation alterations adjacent to Rd 4610 to the one new temporary road entry; decreasing exposure to OHV abuse already occurring on Rd 4610. Mitigate through the use of the narrowest possible temporary road width, revegetate upon completion, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce laws limiting OHV abuse. Associated action: Deconstruct and revegetate Rd 4610-015, scarify and revegetate existing areas degraded by OHV abuse on the north and south sides of Rd 4610 between Units 5 and 10. Provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce laws limiting OHV abuse
  - k. Unit 11: Provide 30ft. no-cut buffers along entire boundary of unit and on either side of the proposed new motorcycle and ATV route that will run through the center of Unit 11, connecting Rd 4610-016 and Rd 4610. Yard trees from Rd 4610-016 to decrease exposure to OHV abuse already occurring on Rd 4610. Mitigate yarding corridors through the use of the narrowest possible corridor widths, revegetate upon completion, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce laws limiting OHV abuse.
  - l. Unit 12a: Provide 30ft. no-cut buffers along boundaries adjacent to Rd 4610 and Rd 4610-019 and Rd 4610-020 and Rd 4610-115. Yard trees from Rd 4610-115 to decrease exposure to OHV abuse already occurring on Rd 4610. Do not rebuild or otherwise use Rd 4610-019 in order to decrease risk of OHV abuse from Rd 4610. Mitigate yarding corridors through the use of the narrowest possible corridor widths, revegetate upon completion, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce laws limiting OHV abuse. Upon completion, scarify and revegetate Rd 4610-115 upon completion, add a berm and

ditch (and boulders if available) at beginning of road, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce the road closure. Bark observed a high presence of wetlands in this unit, including on both sides of Rd 4610-019. Bark suggests providing a minimum 30ft buffer for all wetlands in this unit as identified by the presence of riparian associated vegetation, primarily red alder, black cottonwood, skunk cabbage, and/or devil's club. Associated actions: Close, revegetate and restore "high impact OHV areas" as identified by the map contained in the No Whisky EA Appendix E p21. Provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce OHV closure.

- m. Unit 12b: Remove this unit from the Decision. This unit is exceptionally steep, is economically marginal due to proposed skyline yarding methods and will increase the risk of sedimentation into the N. Fork.
- n. Unit 13: Remove this unit from the Decision. This unit is exceptionally steep, is economically marginal due to proposed skyline yarding methods, contains numerous riparian features that have been inadequately buffered, and will increase the risk of sedimentation into the N. Fork.
- o. Unit 14: Remove this unit from the decision. This unit is exceptionally steep, is economically marginal due to proposed skyline and helicopter yarding methods, and will increase the risk of sedimentation into the Lower Clackamas River.
- p. Unit 15:
  - i. For the portion north of Rd 4610: Provide 30ft. no-cut buffers along boundaries adjacent to Rd 4610. Yard trees from a new temporary road to minimize vegetation alterations adjacent to Rd 4610 to the one new temporary road entry; decreasing exposure to OHV abuse already occurring on Rd 4610. Mitigate through the use of the narrowest possible temporary road width, revegetate upon completion, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce laws limiting OHV abuse.
  - ii. For the portion south of Rd 4610: Provide 30ft. no-cut buffers along boundaries adjacent to Rd 4610 and Rd 4611 and Rd 4611-120. Yard trees from Rd 4611-120 to decrease exposure to OHV abuse already occurring on Rd 4610 and Rd 4611. Mitigate yarding corridors through the use of the narrowest possible corridor widths, revegetate upon completion, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce laws limiting OHV abuse. Upon completion, revegetate Rd 4611-120, add a berm and ditch (and boulders if available) at junction of Rd 4611-120 and Rd 4610-121, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce the road closure. Associated actions: Close, revegetate and restore "high impact OHV areas" as identified by the map contained in the No Whisky EA Appendix E p22. Provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce OHV closure.
- q. Unit 16: Provide 30ft. no-cut buffers along boundaries adjacent to Rd 4611-121. Bark observed a high presence of wetlands and intermittent creeks in this unit, including an unmarked intermittent stream west of Rd 4611-121 running east through the center of the unit. Bark suggests providing a minimum 30ft buffer for all wetlands and intermittent streams in this unit as identified by the presence of

- riparian associated vegetation, primarily red alder, black cottonwood, skunk cabbage, and/or devil's club. Associated action: deconstruct Road 4611-125.
- r. Unit 17: Provide 30ft. no-cut buffers along boundaries adjacent to Rd 4611 and Rd 4611-130. Mitigate yarding corridors through the use of the narrowest possible corridor widths, revegetate upon completion, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce laws limiting OHV abuse. Close, revegetate and restore the "high impact OHV area" identified by the map contained in the No Whisky EA Appendix E p23. Provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce OHV closure. Bark found that the forest SE of the "high impact OHV area" that bisects Unit 17 contains an exceptionally high density of snags, wetlands, and an unusually diverse lower and mid-canopy compared to other portions of the No Whisky project. We believe that this portion of the unit provides habitat not found elsewhere and should be removed from the Decision.
  - s. Unit 19: Provide 30ft. no-cut buffers along boundaries adjacent to Rd 4611. Mitigate yarding corridors through the use of the narrowest possible corridor widths, revegetate upon completion, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce laws limiting OHV abuse. Associated action: Bark observed on a field trip that the unmarked road along the southern boundary of Unit 19 continues as a motorcycle trail beyond Unit 19, crossing a tributary of Winslow Ck. Upon completion of logging, this route should be closed, revegetated and restored. Provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce OHV closure.
  - t. Unit 20: Remove unit from Decision. Bark observed a wetland running east-west through the center of the unit, making buffers economically unfeasible. In addition, there is an OHV trail running the southern boundary of the unit, possibly connecting to Rd 4611-136. Associated action: This route should be closed, revegetated and restored. Provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce OHV closure.
  - u. Unit 21: Upon completion of logging, add berms and ditches (and boulders if available) at beginning of reused roads, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce the road closure. Unit 22:
  - v. Unit 23: Remove unit from decision: Riparian vegetation (big stand of alder) in upper portion of unit should be buffered, lower portion riparian reserve is steep and terminates in Boyer ck. The increased sedimentation risk and marginal economics justifies removal of this unit.
  - w. Unit 24: No adjustment.
  - x. Unit 25: Remove unit from Decision. The stands observed by Bark in Unit 25 are exceptionally diverse and contain an unusually high density of snags and minor tree species (cedar and alder). This stand has obviously already benefited from a previous thin and is on a trajectory toward late-successional characteristics. The proposed road building is costly, and is planned along the ridge where a high proportion of the cedar and alder is located.
  - y. Unit 31: No adjustments.
  - z. Unit 34: Remove unit from Decision. The stands observed in this relatively flat portion of the project area contained large snags (we counted 10 snags over 3' dbh

and 20ft tall in one plot less than 1-acre in size) not found in any other unit except for 35. Large cavities were found in these snags suggesting nesting wildlife such as pileated woodpeckers may inhabit these snags. Unlike other units (except for 35), the snags appear to be true legacy snags, and not logged after the fire that occurred in this area. The proposed helicopter yarding is an economic strain on this unit, and Bark is concerned that the likelihood of snags being removed for safety or falling due to wind is very high.

- aa. Unit 35: Remove unit from Decision. The stands observed in this relatively flat portion of the project area contained large snags (we counted 10 snags over 3' dbh and 20ft tall in one plot less than 1-acre in size) not found in any other unit except for 34. Large cavities were found in these snags suggesting nesting wildlife such as pileated woodpeckers may inhabit these snags. Unlike other units (except for 34), the snags appear to be true legacy snags, and not logged after the fire that occurred in this area. The proposed helicopter yarding is an economic strain on this unit, and Bark is concerned that the likelihood of snags being removed for safety or falling due to wind is very high.
- bb. Unit 36: Remove unit from Decision or modify to a single-entry prescription, including obliteration of temporary roads and deconstruction of Rd 4613-125 upon completion. Bark shares ONRC's concerns that the effect of trying to reach these riparian reserves will likely have a greater negative effect than proposed benefits because of the need to build new roads, use skyline logging which can cause more damage to downed woody debris and legacy snags while creating also un-natural linear corridors.
- cc. Unit 37: No adjustment.
- dd. Unit 38: Remove unit from Decision or modify to a single-entry prescription, including obliteration of temporary roads and deconstruction of Rd 4613-125 upon completion. Bark shares ONRC's concerns that the effect of trying to reach these riparian reserves will likely have a greater negative effect than proposed benefits because of the need to build new roads, use skyline logging which can cause more damage to downed woody debris and legacy snags while creating also un-natural linear corridors.
- ee. Unit 39: Remove unit from Decision or modify to a single-entry prescription, including obliteration of temporary roads and deconstruction of Rd 4613-125 upon completion. Bark shares ONRC's concerns that the effect of trying to reach these riparian reserves will likely have a greater negative effect than proposed benefits because of the need to build new roads, use skyline logging which can cause more damage to downed woody debris and legacy snags while creating also un-natural linear corridors.
- ff. Unit 40: No adjustment. Associated action: Deconstruct Rd 4613-125 upon completion, add a berm and ditch (and boulders if available) at beginning of road, and provide a monitoring plan for Law Enforcement Officers to enforce the road closure.

## STATEMENT OF REASONS

Upon reviewing the No Whisky Environmental Assessment and Decision Notice and visiting the planning area, we still have serious concerns about this project.

### 1 INTRO

Bark staff, members, volunteers, and members of our Board of Directors have spent an enormous amount of time over the years in the No Whisky project area.

Despite Bark's involvement in the planning process beginning before scoping and including the submission of 58 pages of substantive feedback during the Preliminary Assessment comment period the No Whisky Timber Sale has remained the same. The EA's response to comments provides no indication of an agency willing to seriously take into account the concerns of the public. The No Whisky scoping proposal was 1,678 acres, and the Decision Notice is 1,678 acres. Bark is disappointed, but not surprised.

As Bark documents below, the EA still does not comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). As described below, it is very clear that the sheer size of No Whisky has made it difficult to complete analysis on a short deadline. NEPA analysis is crucial to Bark, and the public, because it allows Americans to better understand the true nature of proposed actions and their impacts on Mt. Hood National Forest...the *public's* forest. However, NEPA is simply a process, and Bark's substantive concerns as outlined in our PA comments have not been addressed:

- Stream buffers must be increased to adequately protect water quality;
- All snags must be protected;
- No Whisky should result in a net loss of road miles, with a subsequent net decrease in soil disturbance; and
- No Whisky should result in the net *loss* of current and *potential* user-created OHV routes

Ultimately, the concerns below are similar to those found in our PA comments because the EA is similar to the PA.

### 2 The No Whisky Timber Sale Does Not Meet the Stated Purpose and Need of the Project.

Approving a project that does not meet the purpose and need of that project is arbitrary and capricious. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

#### 2.1 Providing forest products should not be sole purpose for action and fails to account for other resource benefits

Bark believes that the No Action Alternative will fulfill 3 out of the 4 stated purposes and needs provided in the No Whisky EA. The only purpose the No Action alternative does not meet is providing wood products. As documented below, it does however meet the other stated purposes and does not include the impacts associated with logging.

Bark is concerned that the project does not include all costs incurred by the proposed project. There is also little indication in the scoping letter whether or not the USFS included costs such as sale administration, monitoring, and sale lay-out in the “cost” of this project. It is omissions such as these that led the General Accounting Office to conclude that the annual costs of the Forest Service’s timber sale program are not determinable. (GAO 2001)

The USFS has not substantiated that recovering the economic value of the trees and providing timber to the economy was necessary, even though this issue has been raised repeatedly by Bark. Notably, the price for timber has dropped dramatically over the past decade. Softwood timber prices are the lowest they have been since mid-year 2003 and before that 1991.<sup>1</sup> There is no indication that there is a significant demand for the trees that would be logged under the No Whisky project.

Moreover, while timbering is still an important sector of the economy, the communities in Clackamas county are no longer timber-dependent: that is, timber production and milling, while still sources of income, are no longer the primary source of income for these localities. In 1988, considered by many as the peak of National Forest logging in the Pacific Northwest, employment in forestry and wood products manufacturing accounted for only 1.8% of total personal income in Clackamas County. In 2003, the year with most recent data available, the total was 0.6%.<sup>2</sup>

In assessing the impact of the agency’s Roadless Area Conservation policy, the Forest Service also concluded that there are no timber dependent communities located within or affected by activities on the Mt. Hood National Forest. *See generally* United States Forest Service, *Roadless Area Conservation Specialists Reports* (visited May 18, 2003) <[http://roadless.fs.fed.us/documents/feis/specprep/socioecon\\_specialist\\_entire.pdf](http://roadless.fs.fed.us/documents/feis/specprep/socioecon_specialist_entire.pdf)>. Therefore, Bark seriously doubts the validity of the claim that the proposed project is “necessary” to provide timber to local economies.

Conspicuously absent from the No Whisky EA are factors that are more difficult to quantify, but that are equally applicable to the decision whether or not to log on public land. These include the economic benefits associated with:

- 1) Recreational opportunities and tourism;
- 2) Commercial and recreational fisheries within the boundaries of the Mt. Hood National Forest and downstream and offshore;
- 3) Habitat for important game species and hunting both within and outside of the Mt. Hood National Forest;
- 4) Water for cities, industries, businesses, and individual households downstream from the Mt. Hood National Forest;
- 5) The regulation of water flowing through rivers and streams, including flood control;
- 6) Non-timber forest products such as wild mushrooms, herbs, and medicinal plants;

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/STATE\\_FORESTS/FRP/Charts.shtml](http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/STATE_FORESTS/FRP/Charts.shtml); Oregon Department of Forestry, Quarterly Adjusted Softwood Log Price Index

<sup>2</sup> Regional Economic Information System May 2005; Bureau of Economic Analysis Table CA05N

- 7) Mitigation of global climate change through absorption and storage of vast amounts of carbon;
- 8) Enhancing the quality of life of neighboring communities;
- 9) Harboring biological resources that either have value now or have as yet unknown but potentially large economic and social value;
- 10) Harboring biological and genetic resources that can improve the long-term productivity of all forest land;
- 11) Pest-control services provided by species that prey on agriculture and forest pests, and;
- 12) Pollination services provided by species that pollinate important forest and agricultural crops.

These are important economic benefits generated by national forests in every part of the nation, including the Mt. Hood National Forest. The Forest Service has extensive literature and sources of data that it can rely upon to quantify the magnitude of these economic benefits at the national, forest, and project level. The Forest Service seems able to place a value on standing timber when the federal government pursues private parties that have damaged or illegally removed forest products, generally assessing “replacement costs” to the offending party. It is curious that the agency seems able to do this only when it believes that it has been unlawfully deceived, but not when it offers subsidized public timber for sale.

Despite Forest Service claims to the contrary, it *is* feasible to accurately predict the economic value of recreation, scenic resources, and other resources derived from a forest without logging it. *See generally, ECONorthwest, Seeing the Forests for their Green (2000).* An additional study prepared by John Talberth and Karyn Moskowitz explains that from a social and economic perspective, our national forests are far more valuable standing, growing, dying, and regenerating as standing forests rather than as converted paper and wood products. While lumber and wood products are readily available from the 80% of forested land in the United States outside of national forests, clean water, recreation, wildlife, and other public uses and values of great economic benefit generally are not. The small share of the forested land base included in the national forest system must bear nearly 100% of the burden of providing these uses and values. We encourage the Forest Service to read this report, which should be considered part of the administrative record for this project and is incorporated by reference here. *John Talberth & Karyn Moskowitz, The Economic Case Against National Forest Logging, Executive Summary (1999).*

Despite Bark raising this issue in our November 28, 2005, comments, the Forest Service has failed to incorporate externalized costs into the EA. In making the site-specific decision to promote the No Whisky timber sale, the Forest Service needs to incorporate information about externalized costs passed on to communities, businesses, and individuals when national forests are logged. These include the direct, indirect, and cumulative economic costs associated with:

- 1) Lost recreational opportunities and decreased tourism;
- 2) Degraded commercial and recreational fisheries within the boundaries of the Mt. Hood National Forest and downstream;
- 3) Degraded habitat for important game species and loss of hunting opportunities both within and outside of the Mt. Hood National Forest;

- 4) Increased pollution of water for cities, industries, businesses, and individual households downstream from the Mt. Hood National Forest and increased costs of water filtration;
- 5) Increased flooding and disruption of the normal flows in rivers and streams.
- 6) Loss of non-timber forest products such as wild mushrooms, herbs, and medicinal plants;
- 7) Exacerbation of global warming through release of greenhouse gasses;
- 8) Diminished quality of life of neighboring communities;
- 9) Loss of biological resources that either have value now or have as yet unknown but potentially large economic and social value;
- 10) Loss of biological and genetic resources and species that can improve the long-term productivity and aesthetic qualities of all forest land;
- 11) Diminished pest-control services provided by species that prey on agriculture and forest pests;
- 12) Diminished pollination services provided by species that pollinate important forest and agricultural crops.
- 13) Lost jobs and income associated with timber production on private lands that is displaced by Mt. Hood National Forest timber sales;
- 14) Lost jobs and income associated with the production of alternative and recycled products that is displaced by subsidized Mt. Hood National Forest timber sales;
- 15) Death, injury, and property damage associated with logging on the Mt. Hood National Forest, and;
- 16) Increased risk of severe wildfires caused by adverse changes in microclimate, increased human access, and slash generated by timber sales.

These externalized costs are generated by national forest logging in every part of the nation, including the Mt. Hood National Forest. The Forest Service has extensive literature and sources of data that it can rely upon to quantify the magnitude of these externalized costs at the national, forest, and project level. This information should be utilized in the economic analysis for the No Whisky timber sale and reported to the public. Failure to incorporate externalized costs into the No Whisky timber sale decision violates numerous statutes, regulations, and rules governing Forest Service management activities described *infra*.

Even without the ECONorthwest and Talberth & Moskowitz studies and reports to guide the economic analysis of the Forest Service, existing statutes, regulations, and government guidance should provide appropriate guidance for the economic analysis on the No Whisky timber sale project. First, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the agency to develop some method of assessing the value of standing timber as opposed to timber processed as lumber and other more traditional consumer products. NEPA states “all agencies of the Federal Government shall...identify and develop methods and procedures...which will ensure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decision making along with economic and technical considerations.” 42 U.S.C. § 4332(B). The regulation implementing this statutory section states that while a cost benefit analysis is not *required* for a project, if it is “relevant to the choice among environmentally different alternatives being considered for the proposed action, it *shall be* incorporated by reference or appended to the statement as an aid in evaluating the environmental consequences.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.23 (emphasis added).

In planning the No Whisky timber sale, the Forest Service needs to meet NEPA's requirements to fully disclose the direct, indirect, and cumulative economic impacts of the timber sale program and to give appropriate consideration to the full-scope of the various environmental factors (i.e., incorporate important natural resource benefits and externalized costs) that are traditionally absent in the decision-making documents that flow from the Clackamas River Ranger District. 42 U.S.C. §§ 4332(C), 4332(B). By failing to utilize appropriate professional expertise found in the ECONorthwest and Talberth & Moskowitz studies that are capable of disclosing all natural resource benefits and externalized costs, the Forest Service is in violation of NEPA's mandate to rely upon a systematic and interdisciplinary approach to decision making. *Id.* § 4332(A). By ignoring important natural resource benefits and externalized costs, the Forest Service also runs afoul of regulations implementing NEPA that require full disclosure of direct, indirect, and cumulative economic impacts, identification of environmental effects and values in adequate detail so that they can be compared with economic and technical analyses, rigorous analysis of the benefits of implementing the "no action" alternative in timber sales, and use of appropriate professional expertise. 40 C.F.R. §§ 1501.2(a); 1501.2(b); 1502.6; 1502.16; 1502.24; 1507.2(a); 1507.2(b); 1508.7; 1508.8; 1508.27.

Second, the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) imposes additional requirements on the Forest Service in terms of conducting an economic analysis for timber sales. The regulations implementing this statute state that Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMPs) "shall provide for multiple use and sustained yield of goods and services from the National Forest System in a way that maximizes long term net public benefits in an environmentally sound manner." 36 C.F.R. § 219.1(a). In turn, the regulations define "net public benefit" as

an expression used to signify the overall long-term value to the nation of all outputs and positive (benefits) less all associated inputs and negative effects (costs) *whether they can be quantitatively valued or not. Net public benefits are measured by both qualitative and quantitative criteria rather than a single measure or index.*

*Id.* § 219.3 (emphasis added). Although these regulations refer to LRMPs specifically, because site-specific projects must comply with larger land management plans, the requirement that LRMPs must incorporate values such as recreation and watershed health into a cost-benefit analysis is equally applicable to site-specific projects. *Id.* § 219.10(e); 16 U.S.C. § 1604(i).

NFMA regulations go on to explain that land management plans must be implemented through site-specific projects that are sensitive to changing economic realities. They state that national forest lands must be managed "in a manner that is sensitive to economic efficiency," and that managers must be responsive "to changing conditions in land and other resources and to changing social and economic demands of the American people." 36 C.F.R. §§ 219.1(b)(13), (b)(14). As the ECONorthwest and Talberth & Moskowitz studies indicate, there are in fact ways to calculate the economic value of standing forests, which denotes a change in the way that the American public demands that their public lands are managed.

As one of 14 "Urban" National Forests managed by the Forest Service, Mt. Hood National Forest faces very different demands from the public. The No Whisky EA, however, uses an

over-simplified economic analysis model that only addresses value of timber to be removed and costs associated with harvesting. (p 75)

The Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resource Planning Act (REA), as amended by the National Forest Management Act, imposes similar requirements on the Forest Service. 16 U.S.C. §§ 1600–1614 (2000). The REA requires the agency to: incorporate natural resource benefits and externalized costs into decisions affecting the national forests; secure the maximum benefits of multiple use sustained yield management; conduct comprehensive economic assessments of all National Forest resources; identify all costs and all benefits associated with REA Program outputs; insure consideration of the economic aspects of renewable resource management; improve Forest Service accountability when it prepares annual budgets and reports to Congress on the costs and benefits of its programs; and conserve forests and promote the use of recycled products. 16 U.S.C. §§ 1600(7); 1601(d)(1); 1600(3); 1602(2); 1604(g)(3); 1606(a); 1606(b); 1606(c); 1606(d). Regulations implementing both NFMA and the REA require the Forest Service to maximize net public benefits, evaluate the relative values of all National Forest resources, consider all market and non-market costs and all benefits of management decisions, and assign monetary values to goods and services to the extent that they can be assigned. 36 C.F.R. §§ 219.1; 219.4(a)(1); 219.4(b)(1)(ii); 219.12; 219.13; 219.14. In this case, it would be appropriate if the Forest Service mentioned and followed these statutes and regulations, so that the No Whisky timber sale would comply with them.

Third, the Forest Service needs to follow the Multiple Use, Sustained Yield Act (MUSYA) by incorporating important natural resource benefits and externalized costs into the No Whisky timber sale. 16 U.S.C. § 528–531 (2000). Without incorporating natural resource benefits and externalized costs into these decisions, the Forest Service cannot meet MUSYA's requirements to administer National Forests for all of their resources, to maximize public benefits, and to give due consideration to the relative resource values of all National Forest resources. 16 U.S.C. §§ 528, 529, 531.

Finally, other federal guidance explains the types of factors that should be considered in any cost-benefit analysis undertaken for a federal project. The Office of Management and Budget has stated that cost-benefit analyses

should include comprehensive estimates of the expected benefits and costs to *society* based on established definitions and practices for program and policy evaluation. Social net benefits, and not the benefits and costs to the Federal Government, should be the basis for evaluating government programs or policies that have effects on private citizens or other levels of government. Social benefits and costs can differ from private benefits and costs as measured in the marketplace because of imperfections arising from: (i) *external economies or diseconomies* where actions by one party impose benefits or costs on other groups that are not compensated in the market place; (ii) monopoly power that distorts the relationship between marginal costs and market prices; and (iii) taxes or subsidies.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, CIRCULAR A-94 § 6 (1992) (emphasis in original). As applied to the management of the timber sale program, this guidance clearly indicates the need

not only for analysis of the socioeconomic benefits of unlogged forests in areas where logging is contemplated, but also an analysis of the rate of return that could be achieved if timber sale monies were spent on other projects such as recreation, wildlife, or watershed restoration.

While not binding to the same extent as statutes and regulations, the Forest Service Handbook and Manual also provide guidance regarding conducting an adequate economics analysis for timber sales. The agency's Economic and Social Analysis Handbook requires the Forest Service to maximize net public benefits and fully account for all market and non-market benefits and costs in the context of market studies, economic efficiency analysis, and economic impact assessments of its plans and programs. FSH 1909.17.11.1; 1909.17.14.1; 1909.17.14.11; 1909.17.14.6; 1909.17.23. The Forest Service's Timber Sale Preparation Handbook requires the agency to address all marketed and non-marketed costs and benefits in analyses of the financial and economic efficiency of individual timber sales and the timber sale program as a whole. FSH 2409.18.13.1; 2409.18.32. Similarly, the Forest Service Manual requires the Forest Service to: manage the timber sale program so that total benefits exceed total costs; account for non-timber economic effects in its timber sale analyses; ensure that economic values used in economic efficiency and economic impact assessments adequately reflect biological, economic, and social conditions; and base its decisions on the economic and social impacts and costs and benefits. FSM 2403.4; 2403.5; 1971.5; 1970.1(1), (2), (3); 1970.2; 1970.3(1), (5). The No Whisky timber sale documents should mention and comply with these recommendations.

In sum, the No Whisky EA failed to consider these studies, statutes, regulations, and other guidance. Bark believes that an EIS with a full economic analysis for this proposed project is the only way to avoid being arbitrary and capricious and found in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

## 2.2 The No-Action Alternative will "Maintain health, vigor and growth that results in larger trees on 1,633 acres of matrix in the project area"

The No Whisky EA cites the Mt. Hood Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) pages Four-90 and Four-292 for the statement "This action is needed because these second-growth plantations are experiencing a slowing of growth due to overcrowding and some are experiencing suppression caused mortality." (p 5) Upon further inspection, neither citation refers to any such need nor does it address "suppression caused mortality." The No Whisky EA states that "All of the action alternatives would equally meet this objective within the matrix land while the no-action alternative would not." (p40) However no evidence is provided to support this statement.

In fact, on page 41 the EA states that the units that have been commercially thinned are 10 to 20 years from reaching a Relative Density (RD) of 55, when stands display evidence of suppression and mortality. The implication is that the No Action alternative will meet the purpose of "maintain health, vigor and growth" in units (2, 3, 6, 7, 9-12, 15-17, 19-21). For the remaining units (1, 4, 5, 8, 13, 14, 23-25, 31, 34-40) the EA suggests that "in most cases" they exceed an RD of 55, but there is no further analyses of which units. (p 41)

While the EA suggests that the No Action alternative currently meets the purpose and need for units 2, 3, 6, 7, 9-12, 15-17, 19-21, the EA is lacking any analysis of how the expected mortality rates predicted for units 1, 4, 5, 8, 13, 14, 23-25, 31, 34-40 (those with an RD “in most cases” over 55) will also meet the purpose and need. On page 41 the EA states, “These diseases [root disease and mistletoe], when present at low to moderate levels do not seriously compromise timber productivity and they result in down wood, some trees with the elements of wood decay and variability of spacing.” The succession of forests is dependent on disturbance, and the No Action alternative will clearly result in disturbance. In even-aged Western hemlock stands in southeast Alaska it was found that rot disturbance facilitated the succession from even-aged to late-seral. (Hennon 1995)

The November 8, 2005, No Whisky scoping letter contained a purpose and need that read, “Maintain health, vigor, and growth that results in larger wind firm trees.” In the EA, this statement no longer contains the term “wind firm,” but there is no explanation. Instead, the Forest Service asserts, “These second-growth stands are stable and windfirm.” (EA, p 41) Bark is concerned about windthrow exacerbated by overly aggressive thinning prescriptions. How was it determined between November 8, 2005, and February 17, 2006, that the 1,678 acres of No Whisky are “windfirm?”

### 2.3 The No-Action Alternative will “enhance diversity on 1,678 acres in the project area

The EA suggests that suppression caused disease and mortality are likely to occur in units 1, 4, 5, 8, 13, 14, 23-25, 31, 34-40 (those with an RD “in most cases” over 55). On page 41 the EA states, “These diseases [root disease and mistletoe], when present at low to moderate levels do not seriously compromise timber productivity and they result in down wood, some trees with the elements of wood decay and variability of spacing.” In reading this, it appears that the Forest Service is suggesting that the resulting variability of horizontal and vertical structure will increase gaps in the canopy and more sunlight will reach the forest floor, resulting in increased diversity of understory vegetation. However, the Forest Service summarily rejects the No Action alternative suggesting that growth suppression and mortality will continue to occur under this scenario and that understory vegetation would continue to be suppressed. (EA, p 41) Bark believes that an adequate analysis of the No Action alternative should address the variability created by suppression caused mortality.

Laminated Root Rot (*Phellinus* (*Poria*) *weirii*) is found within and around units 1-14 [non-thinned units include 1,4,5,13,14] and is helping to create diversity within these units. (North Fork Watershed Analysis, Map 2-13) It is respected by forest ecologists as a natural agent of biodiversity. It provides a refugia where species that tend to disappear from dense conifer forests can persist. These species include not only broadleaf trees, and shrubs and western red cedar, but animals too. Root rot patches are ideal deer and moose habitat. The rot targets Douglas fir, but cedars are resistant, hardwoods immune, and red alder is toxic to it. (Mathews 1999)

In addition, the EA does not analyze how logging will increase vegetation diversity other than the opening of gaps and by decreasing the percentage of Douglas fir trees in the stand. Both of these goals will be accomplished through the natural mortality described above, but neither will truly increase plant diversity as defined by number of plant species.

For direction on plant diversity the Mt. Hood Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) provides suggested Plant Association and Management Guides for specific zones. (Four-67) The EA does not analyze plant associations in relation to the above purpose and need nor does it even give the reader an understanding of what zone the project area lies in. Bark believes that the No Whisky project fails to meet the clear purpose of “enhancing diversity.”

#### 2.4 The No-Action Alternative will enhance riparian reserves on 45 acres in the project area

We are concerned that logging 45 acres of Riparian Reserves without considering the site-specific need of this treatment does nothing to contribute to species and structural diversity that the purpose requires. The Forest Service has failed to demonstrate that the No Whisky project will meet the stated purpose and need of developing late-successional conditions in Riparian Reserves. In section 2.2.1 of the EA (page 6), the Forest Service asserts, “Plantations can be enhanced by thinning to accelerate the development of mature and late-successional stand conditions,” citing the EA sections 3.2.2, 4.2.6, and 4.3.3. Section 3.2.2 simply does not exist in the EA. Section 4.2.6 simply states that Alternative D would present the least risk to water quality and fisheries because it does not include entry into Riparian Reserves (this is similar to Alternative A, the no-action alternative). In no way does 4.2.6 discuss enhancement of Riparian Reserves. Section 4.3.3 asserts that the No Action alternative would lead to increased mortality and susceptibility to disease in Riparian Reserves. In 4.3.2 the EA suggests that such disturbance is beneficial, “These diseases [root disease and mistletoe], when present at low to moderate levels do not seriously compromise timber productivity and they result in down wood, some trees with the elements of wood decay and variability of spacing.” Furthermore, Section 4.3.3 provides no evidence that logging will enhance the Riparian Reserves.

The EA states that “action is needed to forest products consistent with the Northwest Forest Plan goal of maintaining the stability of local and regional economies.” (p 5) However, the Northwest Forest Plan prohibits counting riparian reserve volume towards the PSQ for a National Forest. The Standards and Guidelines state that “Riparian Reserve acres shall not be included in calculations of the timber base.” *S&Gs*, C-31. However, the No Whisky timber sale appears to count riparian reserve harvest towards the attainment of PSQ targets, in violation of the Northwest Forest Plan. This is arbitrary and capricious. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

In order to remain consistent with the NFP and MHFP, Bark recommends that the Forest Service drop the proposed harvest in riparian reserves.

### 3 The Project Potentially Violates the National Environmental Policy Act, the National Forest Management Act, the Clean Water Act, National Historic Preservation Act, and the Endangered Species Act.

#### 3.1 The No Whisky timber sale should avoid violating the National Environmental Policy Act and its implementing regulations.

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321–4370d (1994 & Supp. III 1997); 40 C.F.R. § 1500–1508.28 (1998). This project should avoid decisions that are rendered in an

arbitrary and capricious manner which would be in violation of the Administrative Procedures Act. Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 551–559, 701–706, 1305, 3105, 3344 (1994 & Supp. III 1997).

### 3.1.1 The No Whisky Timber Sale requires an Environmental Impact Statement

All of the CEQ’s criteria for significance (40 CFR §1508.27) requiring completion of an EIS are present in this timber sale. The Finding of No Significant Impact for this project is arbitrary and capricious.

*1) Impacts can be both beneficial and adverse and a significant effect may exist regardless of the perceived balance of effects.*

Due to the extremely high levels of recreational use in the No Whisky project area it is likely that all impacts will be significant.

*2) The degree of the impact on public health or safety.*

The presence of legal and illegal OHV and shooting activity create elevated levels of risk to public safety that will be impacted by the No Whisky project. Although Bark has not yet received the document, we expect that the current closure of LaDee Flat to OHV use and target shooting invoke the need to improve safety in that area. OHV use has been linked to safety concerns on Mt. Hood National Forest in the Wildcat area, and the Wildcat Mountain Road Repairs and Restoration project specifically addresses how to improve safety for activities such as “mud bogging.” Concerns from the Forest Service that the No Whisky project will increase the distribution of these activities is a clear risk to public safety. (EA, p 8)

*3) Unique characteristics of the geographic area.*

The No Whisky project area is unique due to the presence of three endangered or threatened fish species that occur in the North Fork Clackamas River drainage: Lower Columbia River steelhead, Upper Willamette River Chinook salmon, and Lower Columbia River coho salmon. The OHV use further separates this locale from others. The OHV use has led to the area’s nomination as a potential playground for these vehicles in the upcoming Mt. Hood OHV plan. The flat terrain and already extensive network of legal and illegal OHV routes has made it a natural candidate for the plan. However, the EA does not address the OHV plan, or the unique problems associated with the expected growth of such activities.

*4) The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial,*

Logging of this scale in the Clackamas River Watershed has been, and still is highly controversial. The last logging project of this magnitude planned in the Clackamas drainage was the Eagle Creek timber sales, which due to years of controversy and ending in congressional intervention, were cancelled. The Clackamas River provides drinking water to the cities of Oregon City, West Linn, and Lake Oswego. Controversy is further documented by the high

number of comments received by the Forest Service on this project, compared to other timber plans in the Clackamas River Ranger District.

*5) The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are likely to be highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.*

Contained *infra*, Bark provides evidence that thinning to improve forest health is at best scientifically uncertain, and at worst threatens short-term and long-term forest health.

*6) The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future action with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.*

The Clackamas District has clear plans to increase commercial logging similar to No Whisky. The process by which No Whisky is developed is likely to be mirrored throughout the district for many years to come.

*7) Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.*

The foreseeable and cumulative impacts of the No Whisky timber sale are not disclosed. See Bark's comments at 3.1.5 for a detailed discussion of how these impacts are significant and how the EA fails to analyze them.

*8) The degree to which the action may adversely affect National Historic Register listed or eligible to be listed sites or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural or historical resources.*

The EA states that there are no historic resources in the No Whisky project area. (p 77)

*9) The degree to which the action may adversely affect ESA listed species or critical habitat.* The No Whisky project will potentially affect three endangered or threatened fish species that occur in the North Fork Clackamas River drainage: Lower Columbia River steelhead, Upper Willamette River Chinook salmon, and Lower Columbia River coho salmon.

*10) Whether the action threatens a violation of environmental protection law or requirements.* No Whisky potentially violates NEPA, NFMA, the ESA, and the Northwest Forest Plan.

### 3.1.2 The No Whisky Timber Sale Should Provide a Reasonable Range of Alternatives

NEPA mandates that an agency "shall to the fullest extent possible: use the NEPA process to identify and assess the reasonable alternatives to proposed actions that will avoid or minimize adverse effects of these actions upon the quality of the human environment." 40 C.F.R. § 1500.2(e). NEPA also requires the USFS to "study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to the recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses available resources as provided by section 102(2)(E) of 40

C.F.R. § 1501.2 (c).” *Id.* The No Whisky Project needs to give a meaningful evaluation of alternatives to the proposed action.

Environmental analysis documents must “[r]igorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” to the project. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(a). The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), which promulgated the regulations implementing NEPA, characterizes the discussion of alternatives as “the heart of the environmental impact statement.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14. A decisionmaker must explore alternatives in sufficient enough detail to “sharply defin[e] the issues and provid[e] a clear basis for choice among options by the decisionmaker and the public.” *Id.* § 1502.14. All reasonable alternatives must receive a “rigorous exploration and objective evaluation..., particularly those that might enhance environmental quality or avoid some or all of the adverse environmental effects.” *Id.* § 1500.8(a)(4). The analysis of the alternatives must be “sufficiently detailed to reveal the agency’s comparative evaluation of the environmental benefits, costs and risks of the proposed action and each reasonable alternative.” *Id.*

The Ninth Circuit stated in *California v. Block* that “[a]s with the standard employed to evaluate the detail that NEPA requires in discussing a decision’s environmental consequences, the touchstone for our inquiry is whether an EIS’s selection and discussion of alternatives fosters informed decision-making and informed public participation.” *California v. Block*, 690 F.2d 753, 767 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982).<sup>3</sup> The purpose of the multiple alternative analysis requirement is to insist that no major federal project be undertaken without intense consideration of other more ecologically sound courses of action, including shelving the entire project, or of accomplishing the same result by entirely different means. *Environmental Defense Fund v. Corps of Engineers*, 492 F.2d 1123, 1135 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1974); *Methow Valley Citizens Council v. Regional Forester*, 833 F.2d 810 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987), *rev’d on other grounds*, 490 U.S. 332 (1989) (agency must consider alternative sites for a project). The Ninth Circuit has concluded that “the existence of a viable but unexamined alternative renders an environmental impact statement inadequate.” *Alaska Wilderness Recreation & Tourism v. Morrison*, 67 F.3d 723, 729 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.1995).

Other courts have stated that in order to comply with NEPA, “the discussion of alternatives ‘must go beyond mere assertions’ and provide sufficient data and reasoning to enable a reader to evaluate the analysis and conclusions and to comment on the EIS.” *Citizens Against Toxic Sprays v. Bergland*, 428 F. Supp. 908, 933 (D. Or. 1977). A detailed and careful analysis of the relative merits and demerits of the proposed action and possible alternatives is of such importance in the NEPA scheme that it has been described as the “linchpin” of the environmental analysis. For this reason, the discussion of alternatives must be undertaken in good faith; it is not to be employed to justify a decision already reached. *Id.*

---

<sup>3</sup> Although an Environmental Environmental Assessment need not conform to the same requirements as an EIS, it must nevertheless include sufficient information to determine what the impacts of a proposed action will be, and “must support the reasonableness of the agency’s decision not to prepare” a full EIS. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.9; *Southern Oregon Citizens Against Toxic Sprays v. Clark (SOCATS)*, 720 F.2d 1475, 1480 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 1028 (1984). The court has stated that “were an EA simply a statement that an agency can take an action without filing an EIS, it would not fulfill the mandate of NEPA nor provide the decision-maker or the public with information about the choice.” *Sierra Club v. Watkins*, 808 F. Supp. 852, 871 (D.D.C. 1991).

NEPA requires the agency to include a no action alternative as the environmental baseline for a project. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(c). However, NEPA also requires the agency to “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives.” *Id.* § 1502.12(a). In this case, the agency has clearly failed to explore all reasonable alternatives. By narrowly defining the action alternative, the USFS forecloses other potential projects in the planning area.

### 3.1.2.1 Potential alternatives to consider

#### 3.1.2.1.1 Thinning of previously unthinned stands

As previously stated in Section 2, Bark believes that those units already thinned and with an RD of less than 55 do not meet any purpose and need except for producing timber. Bark encourages the consideration of an alternative that does not include these stands.

#### 3.1.2.1.2 No roadbuilding, riparian reserve logging, or expensive helicopter logging.

The EA provides an alternative, C, which excludes road building or riparian reserve logging. however, it substitutes helicopter harvest for ground-based harvest in units where roads would not be built. Bark is concerned about the extreme increase in harvest costs associated with helicopter yarding. Bark encourages the consideration of an alternative that benefits from the decrease in ecological impact from road-building but is not encumbered by excessive helicopter costs, i.e. alternative C with the 223 acres of helicopter yarding removed.

#### 3.1.2.1.3 A non-commercial, restoration alternative for the proposed project.

Reasonable and practicable alternatives to the proposed action exist and have been identified in earlier comments by Bark and include a non-commercial restoration-only alternative including road removal and other noncommercial activities. In contrast, the No Whisky project proposes to treat stands showing little sign of “needing” timber harvest in order to develop late-successional characteristics. The alternatives considered in the scoping letter were unreasonably narrow and did not allow a meaningful discussion of other means of achieving the purpose and need of the project. The highly restricted range of alternatives evaluated and considered violates the very purpose of NEPA’s alternative analysis requirement, which is to foster informed decision-making and full public involvement. 42 U.S.C. §§ 4331, 4332(2)(E); 40 C.F.R. § 1508.9(b). *See also Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizen’s Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 349 (1989).

The courts have held that the failure to consider a restoration-only alternative is fatal to the government’s environmental analysis of a timber sale:

Plaintiffs also raise serious questions as to whether the BLM adequately provided the public with a restoration alternative. The AR discloses that a “rehabilitation-only” alternative was considered initially, but the EA presented three action alternatives, and each included salvage logging. Although defendants respond by referring to elements of a restoration alternative that can be found in the EA, and by arguing that a rehabilitation-only alternative would be “inconsistent” with the applicable Resource Management Plan, which calls for commercial logging in the Timber Basin area, these arguments fail to dispel the serious questions plaintiffs raise on this issue. Undisputed testimony at the Environmental injunction hearing indicated the Resource Management Plan does not

preclude rehabilitation-only alternatives. There is a serious question as to whether the BLM's failure to include a restoration-only alternative thwarted NEPA's two primary goals: insuring the agency has fully contemplated the environmental effects of its action; and insuring the public has sufficient information to challenge the agency. *Idaho Sporting Congress*, 137 F.3d 1146, 1151 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998).

*League of Wilderness Defenders – Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project et al. v. Zelinski*, 187 F.Supp.2d 1263 (D. Or. 2002). By narrowly defining the action alternative, the USFS forecloses other potential projects in the planning area. The highly restricted range of alternatives evaluated and considered violates the very purpose of NEPA's alternative analysis requirement, which is to foster informed decision-making and full public involvement. 42 U.S.C. §§ 4331, 4332(2)(E); 40 C.F.R. § 1508.9(b). *See also Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizen's Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 349 (1989).

One purpose and need of the proposed No Whisky timber sale is to develop more “mature and late-successional stand conditions.” In all projects involving “forest health” goals, the Forest Service Manual explicitly requires consideration of alternatives without commercial logging. The Manual states, “where timber harvest is proposed primarily for the purpose of achieving forest stewardship purposes...a full range of alternatives, including practical and feasible non-harvest options, must be analyzed in the environmental analysis process.” UNITED STATES FOREST SERV., FOREST SERVICE MANUAL 2432.22c.

The Forest Service is also required to analyze a non-logging alternative under NEPA. Because commercial logging causes undesirable impacts on the environment, the agency must include an alternative that does not include such impacts. The regulations implementing NEPA explain that the agency must “develop other alternatives fully and impartially. Ensure that the range of alternatives does not prematurely foreclose options that might protect, restore, and enhance the environment. Consider reasonable alternatives even if outside the jurisdiction of the Forest Service.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(c). The agency must develop such an alternative even if implementing the same would not meet current policy. The NFMA regulations note that “reasonable alternatives which may require a change in existing law or policy to implement shall be formulated if necessary to address a major public issue, management concern, or resource opportunity identified during the planning process.” 36 C.F.R. § 219.12(f)(5).

The agency has failed to comply with these mandates. Instead, the MHNF proposed a project that would log 1720 acres and construct or reconstruct roads. There is very little in this timber sale to suggest that it is truly a “restoration” project. As such, the proposed project should not go forward.

The Forest Service had before it many potential alternatives for the proposed project, but unreasonably rejected those that did not contain a commercial timber harvest component. For example, the scoping letter did not include a restoration-only alternative that proposed no commercial timber harvest, as Bark proposed in previous commenting opportunities. Disregarding this viable alternative that would meet the purpose and need of the project is inconsistent with NEPA's requirement that a range of alternatives be considered in an

environmental analysis, especially when given the repeated public requests that a restoration alternative be fully considered. *California v. Block*, 690 F.2d 753 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982).

The Bark repeatedly requested that the USFS consider an alternative that would not simply leave alone an area that has been heavily impacted by both Forest Service management and illegal dumping/OHV use for years, but actively work to restore the ecosystems in the planning area without further impairing the ecosystem with more unnecessary logging and road building. For example, road densities in certain subwatershed are likely to exceed recommended standards and the effects of past logging activities continue to impact the site. An alternative should have been fully considered that consisted of removal and restoration of Forest Service roads, control of exotic invasive species established as a result of past Forest Service logging activities, sediment control activities, and other measures that would help recover the area. The proposed No Whisky project does not constitute forest restoration.

The Mt. Hood Forest Plan and associated documents clearly indicate that restoration is needed on the forest. Given these goals of the Forest Plan, it is inconsistent for the Forest Service not to include a genuine restoration alternative. Without considering an alternative that would help restore habitat conditions with the least amount of negative impacts, the Forest Service is not heading in the direction of improved ecosystems, but instead contributing to the decline of sensitive terrestrial and aquatic species and their habitat.

3.1.3 The No Whisky Environmental Assessment fails to analyze impacts and disclose them in such a way as to give the public a basis to provide sufficient feedback.

In planning the No Whisky timber sale the Forest Service is required not only to analyze the impacts of the proposed action but, “Encourage and facilitate public involvement in decisions which affect the quality of the human environment.” 40 C.F.R. 1500.2 § (d) Bark believes that the No Whisky EA has failed do either of these.

Having received the EA on February 17, 2006, Bark immediately began exploring the proposed actions described in the EA. On February 19 we visited multiple No Whisky timber sale area units including 13 and 25 and found no markings of any kind suggesting potential timber sale boundaries or prescriptions. In fact, there was no evidence of any field markings whatsoever, suggesting that the EA was written without even a visit to the stands proposed for harvest. It wasn't until March 9 that Bark was informed that boundary markings had been made. Subsequent field trips to Unit 12b revealed no markings whatsoever. Such lack of field work has made it virtually impossible for Bark to understand the proposed action or provide the Forest Service with constructive feedback.

Given the lack of field markings, Bark has been almost entirely reliant on the scoping letter and EA to better understand the proposed action and provide the Forest Service with constructive feedback. The following inconsistencies have made such an effort virtually impossible:

- The inconsistent use of the term “no-harvest” (p. 14, 19, 20, 26, 30) and “no-cut” (29, 30, 36) in reference to riparian stream buffers leaves the public unable to adequately or accurately comment on this plan.
- The inconsistent use of the term “no-harvest” and “no-cut” in reference to riparian stream buffers for the S&M and Sensitive aquatic mollusk *Lyogyrus* (p. 20, 36) clearly violates both the S&M and ESA requirements.
- The November 8, 2005, No Whisky scoping letter contained a purpose and need that read, “Maintain health, vigor, and growth that results in larger wind firm trees.” In the EA, this statement no longer contains the term “wind firm,” but there is no explanation. Instead, the Forest Service asserts, “These second-growth stands are stable and windfirm.” (EA, p 41) Bark is concerned about windthrow exacerbated by overly aggressive thinning prescriptions. How was it determined between November 8, 2005, and February 17, 2006, that the 1,678 acres of No Whisky are “windfirm?”
- New temporary roads are either listed as 1.2 miles (p. 14, 77), 1.5 miles (p. 25), or 7755’ (p. 55, 60), 6225’ (p. 13) and 2800’ (p. 23). Further, since the 2800’ is the smallest of all of these possibilities, its use in the cost/benefit ratio makes that ratio even more arbitrary and capricious.

The No Whisky EA does not provide enough information to determine the extent of indirect, direct, or cumulative environmental impacts associated with the project. Moreover, the EA does not furnish substantive and quantitative evidence showing this project will not cause serious and irreversible damage to soils, forest productivity, plant diversity, water quality, and wildlife habitat. In fact, the evidence strongly suggests that the project will cause significant impacts to these resources that preclude the implementation of the proposed project. An EA (presumably what will follow the No Whisky EA) is – a “concise public document” – must contain “sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an environmental impact statement or a finding of no significant impact.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.9. In this case, the EA does not contain the required information, and does not refer to anything in the analysis file to support its conclusion of no significant impact.

NEPA requires the Forest Service to document and disclose its internal analyses that led to its conclusion of no significant impact. Failing to document and disclose agency decision-making process vitiates NEPA’s goal of providing information to the decision maker and the public “before decisions are made and actions are taken.” 40 C.F.R. §§ 1500.1(b), 1502.24. As the courts have held, “allowing the Forest Service to rely on expert opinion without hard data either vitiates a plaintiff’s ability to challenge an agency action or results in the courts second guessing an agency’s scientific conclusions. As both of these results are unacceptable, we conclude that NEPA requires that the public receive the underlying environmental data from which a Forest Service expert derived her opinion.” *Idaho Sporting Congress v. Thomas*, 137 F.3d 1146, 1150 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998).

The proposed project also violates NFMA because it will permanently impair the productivity of the area due to degradation of soil productivity, significant changes to watershed functions, the introduction of exotic invasive weeds, and the increase in the already high rates of erosion and sedimentation. 36 C.F.R. §§ 219.14 (a)(2); 219.27(a)(1). There is no scientific support in the

EA that these impacts would be adequately mitigated. Therefore, the project must be withdrawn until compliance with NFMA can be obtained.

The EA only briefly describes the types of impacts that logging can cause to soil resources generally; it does not provide a site-specific analysis of **how** the No Whisky project will affect soils within the planning area. The Forest Service is required to conduct a site-specific analysis, and to document **how the proposed project will affect the resource at issue**. 36 C.F.R. § 219.27(a)(1). The agency has failed to do so in this case.

As mentioned previously, not only is the USFS not entitled to violate Forest Plan requirements because they are inconvenient, but also that NFMA states that if Forest Plan standards cannot be met, then the proposed project should not take place. 16 U.S.C § 1604(i); 36 C.F.R. § 219.10(e); *Inland Empire Public Lands Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 88 F.3d. 754 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996); *Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 137 F.3d 1372, 1377 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998).

The Forest Service did not adequately assess the direct and indirect impacts from the proposed project on soil resources. The EA acknowledges that ground-based skidding, logging, and roading negatively affect soil resources. Despite this concession, the EA never addresses how the agency plans to prevent these negative effects from occurring. The lack of a coherent analysis of mitigation measures and logging systems is a clear abdication of the agency's duty to assess the impacts to soil resources and to preserve them. 40 C.F.R. §1 502.16(a)–(b); 36 C.F.R. §§ 219.17(a)(1), 219.23(f).

Assurances by the agency that it can prevent adverse impacts to already damaged soil resources in the planning area are superfluous. What is the Forest's record of adhering to BMPs and preventing soil displacement and erosion? Given the fact that the planning area is experiencing a high level of compaction and displacement, it is improbable that administration of the No Whisky Timber Sale will be any different than past entries.

No Whisky violates a number of soil management directives such as [Four-16] [t]he primary goal of soil management is to maintain or enhance soil productivity as well [Four-293, C1-036] Soil productivity and Watershed improvement activities shall be encouraged.

Until the Forest Service can verify its EA analysis with supporting documentation, the No Whisky timber sale must be withdrawn as the decision to proceed with the project is arbitrary and capricious. 5 U.S.C. 706(2)(A).

#### 3.1.4 The Forest Service must provide a 30-day comment period upon release of an Environmental Assessment (EA)

Due to the inability for Bark to adequately engage in the planning of the No Whisky timber sale because of the insufficient EA and field markings, Bark hopes that the Forest Service will honor a required 30-day comment period upon release of the EA, **prior** to the rendering of any decision document.

The comment period provided by the No Whisky EA simply does not substitute for the comment period expected upon completion of an EA.

U.S. District Court Judge David F. Levi in a June 30, 2005, ruling states,<sup>4</sup> “The court finds that although the CEQ regulations do not require circulation of a draft EA, they do require that the public be given as much environmental information as is practicable, prior to completion of the EA, so that the public has a sufficient basis to address those subject areas that the agency must consider in preparing the EA.”

“[T]he agency must offer significant pre-decisional opportunities for informed public involvement in the environmental review process by releasing sufficient environmental information about the various topics that the agency must address in the EA, such as cumulative impacts, before the EA is finalized.”

### 3.1.5 No Whisky will have cumulatively significant impacts on the environment

The Ninth Circuit has been especially clear regarding the requisite showing that the Forest Service must make when it comes to discussing the cumulative effects of past, present, and future timber harvests. In *Lands Council v. Powell*, the appellate court remarked that “for the public and agency personnel to adequately evaluate the cumulative effects of past timber harvests, the Final Environmental Impact Statement should have provided adequate data of the time, type, place, and scale of past timber harvests and should have explained in sufficient detail how different project plans and harvest methods affected the environment.” *Lands Council v. Powell*, 379 F.3d 738, 745 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004). Similarly, the Ninth Circuit in *Klamath-Siskiyou Wildlands Ctr. v. BLM* observed that a table purporting to examine the cumulative effects of timber harvest was inadequate because “the problem with the entire table is that it does not provide any objective quantification of the impacts” of the past logging. *Klamath-Siskiyou Wildlands Ctr. v. BLM*, 387 F.3d 989, 994 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004) (KS Wild). The court in *KS Wild* went on to state that regarding future projects, “a calculation of the total number of acres to be harvested in the watershed is a necessary component of a cumulative effects analysis, but it is not a sufficient description of the actual environmental effects that can be expected from logging those acres.” *Id.* at 995.

The No Whisky EA does mention some of the other landscape impacts in its summary of cumulative effects, but it fails to *analyze* these effects.

In Section 4.1.2 the EA states, “The land area and the time scale used for cumulative effects *would* vary by resource. The analysis for each affected resource *would* look at the condition of the resource considering effects from past timber sales, road construction, fires and other disturbances.” (No Whisky EA, p 24, emphasis added)

---

<sup>4</sup> *Sierra Nevada v. Weingardt*, No. 04-2727, June 1, 2005; *Conservation Congress v. United States Forest Service*, No. 05-0093, June 22, 2005.

The lack of analysis of cumulative impacts is exemplified by the statement, “A list of past actions is contained in the analysis file.” (No Whisky EA, section 4.1.3, p 24) Despite a FOIA request submitted March 1, 2006, Bark has yet to receive the project file for No Whisky. We hope that the analysis referred to in the EA is truly and analysis of effects, and not simply a listing of past actions. The Ninth Circuit has specifically found the omission of such a discussion inadequate to meet the requirements of NEPA.

### 3.1.5.1 Cumulative effects of OHVs not analyzed

Assuming *arguendo* that the proposed thinning is beneficial to the watershed, NEPA still requires the Forest Service to assess the synergistic effects that this project will have with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. However, given that the North Fork/Lower Clackamas River Watersheds has been extensively logged and managed (and left to illegal OHV use), it is dubious at best that this project will not have an incremental effect on the watershed. See, [http://www.bark-out.org/tsdb/image\\_detail.php?sale=nowhisky&image=No\\_Whisky\\_unknown\\_road\\_2000](http://www.bark-out.org/tsdb/image_detail.php?sale=nowhisky&image=No_Whisky_unknown_road_2000).

The EA states that past Off Highway Vehicle (OHV) and off-road use of skidtrails and roads in the Ladee Flats area has resulted in ongoing erosion. It goes on further to suggest that new skid trails created by No Whisky may lead to increased OHV use in units adjacent to FS Rds 4610 and 4611. However, this statement contains no analysis of the expected impacts associated with this type of activity. In addition, it fails to address the very real impact of OHV abuse that is not contained to roads and skid trails, but occurs anywhere that terrain (most often tree density) does not restrict it.

As stated by Larry D. Reed, a 34-year veteran of Mt. Hood National Forest and reserve law enforcement officer, there is no such thing as a closure for quads (4-wheel ATVs) and motorcycles; the only limiting factor is terrain. (conversation March 14, 2006) As shown in the photo below, full-sized vehicles (jeeps and trucks) are also capable of doing damage where terrain isn't a limiting factor.

The lack of documentation regarding the issue of OHV use and sedimentation production is particularly troubling since it was the #1 aquatic resource issued identified in the Clackamas River Basin Action Plan Appendix A: Summary of Recommendations from the Mt. Hood National Forest (and BLM) Watershed Assessments.



OHV damage observed March 12, off Rd4610. Terrain (lack of trees) allowed for full-sized vehicle to damage ground vegetation other than on skid trails, roads, or landings.

The EA lacks any mention of this impact and does not analyze the effects of the likely increase in effects due to logging and the reduction of tree density.

Finally, Mt. Hood National Forest has initiated an OHV planning process which specifically identifies the No Whisky project area as a potential off-road site. The EA summarily omits any reference to such a plan, despite the obvious potential impacts that could be incurred through the permanent siting of an OHV playground in the project area.

From the EA, Page 5, “A Portion of the No Whisky project overlaps an area called La Dee Flat. This area has experienced intensive public use including unauthorized activities such as garbage dumping, target shooting and off-highway vehicle (OHV) use. In 1998, a legal closure was instituted that restricted vehicle use to certain open roads. However some unauthorized use

continues. Also in 1998, efforts were underway to block user created OHV trails in certain high impact areas. The Forest Service is in the early stages of scoping for the development of an OHV plan for the Forest. La Dee Flat is being considered as an area to allow OHV use on designated roads and trails (s.4.1.6.). The No Whisky project does not include provisions to restore existing OHV trails but does contain design criteria designed to prevent the expansion of OHV use into new areas.”

As for current use, recreational motorized vehicle activity is supposed to be off limits except on open roads and designated parking areas. With the large number of closed roads that are open

within the management area, this requirement has been violated by the Forest. (LRMP, Four-280, B11-037)

FROM EA page 25:

Some have also advocated that instead of a focus on thinning, the EA should plan the restoration of areas damaged by OHV use. This was not developed. The analysis conducted by resource specialists found that the impacts created by unauthorized OHV use were not significant and that past attempts to restore high use areas resulted in the impact shifting to new areas. The Forest is in the early stages of developing a Forest-wide plan for OHV (s. 4.16). That plan is the proper arena for discussion of OHV restoration. This project contains measures designed to prevent the expansion of OHV use onto new temporary roads landings and skid trails (s.3.6.6.6).

The unwillingness of the Forest Service to analyze the cumulative impacts created through implementation of the Forest-wide OHV Plan (of which LaDee Flat has proposed new OHV routes within units of No Whisky) is a violation of NEPA. Furthermore, the assertion that specialists found OHV impacts to be “not significant” is contradicted multiple times within the EA:

- “The localized effect of OHV use within small wetlands and meadows in the La Dee area has resulted in the degradation of some of these habitats.” EA p 68
- “Within the project area, unauthorized OHV use and shooting are occurring. . . .Areas used for shooting are also littered with debris, trash, shells, broken glass, and other remnants of targets. Trees are often targeted until they fall...” EA p 85
- “The District has implemented various projects to reduce unauthorized use. However there are still concerns that logging activities could make new areas avoidable for OHV use and/or shooting.” EA p 85

I

In addition to contradictions raised by the Forest Service, Bark hereby incorporates by reference **Quantifying Threats to Imperiled Species in the United States.**<sup>5</sup> This article quantifies threats to endangered species. Looking at US “species, subspecies and populations that have been added to the federal endangered species list or have been formally proposed for such listing by the USFWS as of 1 January 1996,” (609) the authors found that outdoor recreation harms 27% of endangered species (610). “Within the category of outdoor recreation, the use of off-road vehicles is implicated in the demise of approximately 13% of endangered species” (610).

---

<sup>5</sup> David S. Wilcove; David Rothstein; Jason Dubow; Ali Phillips; Elizabeth Losos *BioScience*, Vol. 48, No. 8. (Aug., 1998), pp. 607-615.

### 3.1.5.2 Effects of past and foreseeable future actions not analyzed

The background document included with the November 8, 2005, scoping letter notes that multiple entries into the matrix stands may occur in order to obtain the desired stand composition. The scoping letter also states that many stands will be reentered that have been ground-based logged in the past. As noted in Appendix E of both the Cloak EA and the South Fork EA “[e]venaged management is the optimal appropriate silvicultural system.” Given that it is reasonably foreseeable that these matrix stands will be entered again to either thin or regenerate them, and that they have been logged in the past, NEPA requires the Forest Service to conduct a cumulative impacts analysis. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.7. It would be expected for this temporally cumulative impact to be addressed in full in an Environmental Assessment. Instead, the No Whisky EA does not even address expected future treatments, despite the scoping letter clearly suggesting that harvest will occur in the foreseeable future as do the silvicultural reports (Appendix E) found in the EAs from Cloak and South Fork.

If the agency fails to assess the nature of the cumulative impacts to species, soil, and aquatic resources within the planning area, the No Whisky timber sale must be withdrawn. In the alternative, the Forest Service should prepare an EIS that assesses the cumulative impacts of this sale in conjunction with other projects in the same watershed.

The Forest Service’s analysis of the cumulative impacts of the No Whisky timber sale must be detailed enough to meet NEPA’s requirement for high quality scientific analysis that would satisfy the “hard look” standard. *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 353 (1989); *Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project v. Blackwood*, 161 F.3d 1208 (9th Cir. 1998) cert. denied, *Ochoco Lumber Co. v. Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project*, 119 S.Ct. 2337 (1999). The courts have also held that the failure to conduct a cumulative impacts analysis is fatal to a project. *Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain v. United States Forest Serv.*, 137 F.3d 1372 (9th Cir. 1998); *Idaho Sporting Congress v. Thomas*, 137 F.3d 1146 (9th Cir. 1998); *Muckleshoot Indian Tribe v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 177 F.3d 800 (9th Cir. 1999).

In addition, there is insufficient analysis in the No Whisky EA regarding how logging and roading activities (planned and rogue) will affect the planning area. NEPA requires this analysis, and the failure to provide it violates the law. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.7. The lack of an adequate cumulative impact analysis to assess the fragmentation of habitat corridors, degradation of water quality, impacts to plant and animal species, and soil health is especially problematic given that the area has been highly impacted by past logging, other management, and illegal use activities. Again, simply stating that other activities are occurring or will occur does not suffice as an adequate cumulative impacts analysis.

### 3.1.5.3 Cumulative, direct, and indirect impacts on forest fragmentation, biological corridors, and dispersal of late-successional species.

The EA fails to adequately assess the cumulative impacts of the present project and other proximate projects on forest fragmentation, loss of habitat connectivity, and dispersal of late-successional species. There must be a detailed examination of the cumulative and direct impacts

to species migration and dispersal affected by the No Whisky timber sale. In conjunction with past harvest and illegal dumping/road building, the No Whisky timber sale is likely to cause significant environmental impacts.

Fragmentation is an important factor in declining biological diversity. Wilcove et al. 1986; Goodman 1987. Habitat fragmentation also seriously threatens the stability and persistence of wild populations because the size and isolation of remaining habitats increases the probability of extinction through demographic, environmental, or genetic stochasticity. Wiens 1976; Soule 1986. Additionally, habitat corridors have been identified as important features of landscape management that allow movement, and thus recolonization, among high-quality habitats. Fragmented corridors may actually serve as a selective filter, allowing movement by some species and blocking movement of others. Noss 1991. *See also, Corridors Affect Plants, Animals, and Their Interactions in Fragmented Landscapes.*

The Northwest Forest Plan requires the Forest Service to maintain connectivity for aquatic and terrestrial species through the Aquatic Conservation Strategy Objectives (ACSOs), maintenance of connectivity corridors, and implementation of the Late Successional Reserve system. *Northwest Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines (NFP S&Gs)*, B-13. The NFP also requires the agency to “maintain and restore spatial and temporal connectivity within and between watersheds.” *Id.* at B-11. For this project, the Forest Service has potentially failed to meet these requirements for at least two reasons.

The North Fork Clackamas River Watershed Analysis notes late-seral habitat is limited (<15%) and riparian areas are similarly compromised. It goes without saying that a combination of the loss of suitable habitat and increase in fragmentation has substantially reduced the amount of suitable habitat for spotted owls currently present within these watersheds. In addition to this too well-known species, there is no indication in the scoping letter regarding how increasing fragmentation in the planning area will affect connectivity for a variety of other species. The EA analysis fails to fully discuss how this project will comply with the NFP when fragmentation is already a significant problem in the watershed.

While Bark agrees that riparian reserves should function as connectivity corridors, the Forest Service needs to indicate whether or not they are serving this function. Without this information, the public and decision maker cannot assess whether the proposed treatments in the riparian reserves are appropriate or necessary. Similarly, the public and decision maker cannot determine whether or not Aquatic Conservation Strategy Objectives (ACSOs) will be met by the proposed project, as meeting ACSOs in riparian areas will be a purpose and need of the No Whisky timber sale.

Clearly the planning area is already suffering the effects of poor land management, but the agency failed to demonstrate that the proposed project will be consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy Objectives that measure watershed connectivity: simply stating that a project will be consistent with the ACSOs does not make it so. Not only is the planning area already very fragmented, but the proposed project also will likely remove millions of board feet of habitat from the landscape. The Forest Service must significantly and robustly support the contention that the No Whisky project will not exacerbate the fragmented condition of the habitat

in the planning area. Given the significant fragmentation in the planning area, the No Whisky project appears at this point to be arbitrary and capricious. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

Due to serious concerns regarding previous timber harvests having eliminated significant portions of the connectivity capacity in the planning area, it is likely unreasonable to log the remaining forest that is providing the meager connectivity in the watershed. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). Moreover, unless the Forest Service provides a compelling and rigorously proven rationale for eliminating connective features from the landscape, and how this decision is consistent with the legal requirement that the agency provide for well-distributed viable populations of species across the forest, this aspect of the sale will remain a sticking point. 36 C.F.R. § 219.19. If connectivity corridors are eliminated, it is impossible for species to disperse across the landscape.

Although it seems reasonable to conclude that further division of the already highly fragmented areas would be a significant impact in and of itself, the EA fails to address how the No Whisky timber sale – combined with adjacent timber and road building projects – would affect species dependent on late-successional forest. The effects considered should include, for example, how increasing the existing level of fragmentation would affect these species' population levels, reproduction, or long-term viability in the watershed and adjacent lands, and in particular it **must** discuss how such fragmentation would affect species requiring large areas of intact forest.

3.1.5.4 The EA does not analyze the impact of global climate change nor local warming trends.

The cumulative effect of reducing forest canopy during this trend of increased temperatures and solar radiation may have significant impacts, yet it is not addressed in the EA.

In conclusion, the EA fails to adequately evaluate the impact of the proposed timber project on habitat fragmentation, biological corridors, and the dispersal of late-successional and wide-ranging species. Intentionally creating barriers to species dispersal fundamentally violates the NFP and MHFP, and is arbitrary and capricious. 16 U.S.C § 1604(i); 36 C.F.R. § 219.10(e); 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

NEPA requires the Forest Service to provide adequate information upon which the public and decision maker can evaluate a project and make a decision about its environmental consequences. 40 C.F.R. § 1500.1.

3.1.6 The Forest Service Improperly Relies on Mitigation Measures In Their NEPA Analysis for the No Whisky timber sale.

3.1.6.1 The scoping letter does not contain an adequate discussion of mitigation measures.

The proposed project will have significant impacts on the quality of the human environment, thereby necessitating the preparation of an environmental impact statement. However, in cases

where an environmental assessment may be the appropriate environmental document, the Forest Service should consider and adopt mitigation measures or alternatives even though the impacts of the proposal may not be “significant.” 40 C.F.R. §§ 1501.3(b), 1508.9(a)(2). In such cases, the NEPA analysis should include a discussion of these measures or alternatives to “assist agency planning and decision making” and to “aid an agency’s compliance with (NEPA) when no environmental impact statement is necessary.” Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ’s National Environmental Policy Act Regulations (40 Questions), 46 Fed. Reg. 18,037.

The Supreme Court has upheld the agency’s duty to consider mitigation measures in preparing environmental documents. *See Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizen’s Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 353 (1989). More generally, omission of a reasonably complete discussion of possible mitigation measures would undermine the “action forcing” function of NEPA. Without such a discussion, neither the agency nor other interested groups and individuals can properly evaluate the severity of the adverse effects.

The Clackamas River Ranger District’s past use of perfunctory descriptions of mitigation measures is inconsistent with the “hard look” it is required to undertake pursuant to NEPA. *See generally, scoping letter*, 15 – 19. The Ninth Circuit has held that “mitigation must be discussed in sufficient detail to ensure that environmental consequences have been fairly evaluated.” *Carmel-By-the-Sea v. United States Dep’t of Transp.*, 123 F.3d 1142, 1154 (9th Cir. 1997). The court has also noted that “a mere listing of mitigation measures is insufficient to qualify as the reasoned discussion required by NEPA.” *Northwest Indian Cemetery Protective Ass’n. v. Peterson*, 795 F.2d 688, 697 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986), *rev’d on other grounds*, 485 U.S. 439 (1988); *see also Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain v. United States Forest Serv.*, 137 F.3d 1372 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998). More recently, the Ninth Circuit held that the Forest Service may not rely on mere conjecture or agency claims without presenting the background and supporting data for those conclusions. *Idaho Sporting Congress v. Thomas*, 137 F.3d 1146 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998).

The EA fails to include a thorough description of the implementation of mitigation measures, their use, efficacy, or anything beyond their mere existence.

### 3.1.6.2 Mitigation measures do not obviate the need to prepare an EIS.

Where an environmental assessment relies on mitigation measures to reach a finding of no significant impact, that mitigation must be assured to occur and must “completely compensate for any possible adverse environmental impacts.” *Cabinet Mountains Wilderness/Scotchman’s Peak Grizzly Bears v. Peterson*, 685 F.2d 678, 682 (D.C. Cir. 1982). If the effectiveness of such mitigation is not assured, then the Forest Service cannot sign a FONSI and must prepare an EIS. *Foundation for North American Wild Sheep v. U.S. Dep’t of Agric.*, 681 F.2d 1172, 1178 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982). In *Northwest Indian Cemetery Protective Ass’n. v. Peterson*, the court determined that NEPA requires agencies to “analyze the mitigation measures in detail (and) explain how effective the measures would be...A mere listing of mitigation measures is insufficient to qualify as the reasoned discussion required by NEPA.” 764 F.2d 581 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985).

In an explanation of its regulations, the CEQ has stated that mitigation-based FONSIIs are inappropriate in most situations:

Mitigation measures may be relied upon to make a finding of no significant impact only if they are imposed by statute or regulation, or submitted by an applicant or agency as part of the original proposal. As a general rule, the regulations contemplate that agencies should use a broad approach in defining significance and should not rely on the possibility of mitigation as an excuse to avoid the EIS requirement.

46 Fed. Reg. 18,038. If a proposal appears to have adverse effects that could be significant, and certain mitigation measures are then developed during the scoping or scoping letter stages, the existence of such possible mitigation does not obviate the need for an EIS. Therefore, if scoping or the scoping letter identifies certain mitigation opportunities without altering the nature of the proposal itself, the agency should continue the EIS process and submit the proposal, and the potential mitigation, for public and agency review and comment. This is essential to ensure that the final decision is based on all the relevant factors and that the full NEPA process will result in enforceable mitigation measures through the Record of Decision. *Id.* at 18,026.

The courts have held that even though the procedural requirements of an EIS are more strict than those required for an EA, an EA requires *more substantial proof* that the mitigation will in fact result in no significant impact than an EIS. The Ninth Circuit has held that if the plaintiff “raises substantial questions whether a project may have a significant effect, an EIS must be prepared.” *Steamboaters v. FERC*, 777 F.2d 1384 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985). The court will not accept conclusory statements that mitigation measures are effective: the agency must be able to support its conclusions with information in the administrative record. *Sierra Club v. Peterson*, 717 F.2d 1409 (D.C. Cir. 1985).

The test for whether mitigation is adequate is not whether it will avoid listing of a species, but rather whether it will completely avoid impacts to the species or reduce those impacts to the level of insignificance. *Cabinet Mountains Wilderness/Scotchman’s Peak Grizzly Bears v. Peterson*, 685 F.2d at 682. There is no assurance that planned mitigation measures for the proposed project will completely compensate for environmental impacts.

A USDA Office of the Inspector General Report concluded that reliance on speculative mitigation measures in order to reach a FONSI significantly compromised environmental quality. OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL, U.S. DEPT’ OF AGRIC., EVALUATION REPORT No. 08801-10-AT: FOREST SERVICE TIMBER SALE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS REQUIREMENTS (1999). The OIG concluded that:

Applicable mitigation measures contained in 10 of 12 decision notices and referenced environmental assessments reviewed, were not always implemented. In addition, mitigation measures were either omitted or incorrectly incorporated into 4 of 12 accompanying timber sale contracts. These mitigation measures are designed to reduce the adverse impacts of timber sale activities on the environment. Generally, mitigation measures were not implemented due to district personnel (a) not being familiar with the mitigation measure contained in the environmental documents, (b) not adequately

monitoring actual implementation of the mitigation measures, (c) not comparing timber sale contract clauses with the applicable environmental documents and, (d) oversight. As a result, streams, wildlife habitat, heritage resources, water quality, and visual quality were or could be adversely affected. In addition, “Findings of No Significant Impact” conclusions (i.e. that there was no significant effect on the quality of the human environment) were questionable... Timber sale field visits disclosed that mitigation measures designed to protect key resource areas were not adequately implemented. The measures involved mitigation of riparian areas and stream management zones, wildlife habitat, heritage resource sites, visual quality, and soils.

Until the USFS is able to substantiate its proposed mitigation measures – i.e., that they are appropriate, will be implemented, and will be effective – the agency must withdraw the proposed project.

### 3.1.6.3 The EA fails to include a detailed monitoring and mitigation plan.

Monitoring is increasingly important in sound forest management, and is considered a cornerstone of proper management of public lands. Bark expected that a monitoring and mitigation plan would be included in the EA, and Bark specifically wanted to know whether or not funding would be sufficient to monitor the effects of the proposed project. Given the experimental nature of the proposed activities in the No Whisky project, a detailed monitoring and mitigation is expected and is likely required.

The regulations implementing NEPA require that agencies “state whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected have been adopted, and if not, why they were not. A monitoring and enforcement program shall be adopted and summarized where applicable for any mitigation.” 40 C.F.R. § 1505.2(c). Additionally,

agencies may provide for monitoring to assure that their decisions are carried out and should do so in important cases. Mitigation (§ 1505.2(c)) and other conditions established in the environmental impact statement or during its review and committed as part of the decision shall be implemented by the lead agency or other appropriate consenting agency. The lead agency shall: (a) Include appropriate conditions in grants, permits or other approvals; (b) Condition funding of actions on mitigation.

*Id.* § 1505.3.

This is a clear requirement that the USFS state whether the agency has undertaken all practicable means to minimize or avoid environmental harm, and that the agency prepare a detailed mitigation plan. The EA’s monitoring plan is vague and clearly unattainable, based on the fact that years of monitoring and mitigation plans have been unable to control the OHV abuse documented in the maps contained in Appendix E of the EA.

## 4 No Whisky EA fails to Adequately Analyze the Impact to water quality and fisheries

According to the Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 313, all federal agencies “shall comply with all Federal, State, interstate, and local requirements, administrative authority, and process and sanctions respecting the control and abatement of water pollution, and federal actors must comply with all record keeping, recording and permitting requirements.” 33 U.S.C. § 1323(a). The Ninth Circuit has interpreted this provision to mean that the U.S. Forest Service must comply with all state water quality standards when carrying out its road-building and logging activities. *Northwest Indian Cemetery Protective Ass’n v. Peterson*, 795 F.2d 688 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986). This means that the Forest Service cannot claim that the agency’s own policies and regulations supersede state water quality standards. In *Northwest Indian Cemetery*, the Forest Service claimed that its Best Management Projects (BMPs) were the only water quality standards applicable. 759 F.2d at 697. The Ninth Circuit held that adherence to BMPs did not automatically ensure that state water quality standards were met. The Ninth Circuit has reiterated this standard. *Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project v. Blackwood*, 161 F.3d 1208, 1214 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998), *cert. denied*, *Ochoco Lumber Co. v. Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project*, 119 S.Ct. 2337 (1999).

Accordingly, the Forest Service must describe how a selected alternative for the No Whisky timber sale would comply with Oregon’s water quality standards. The scoping letter does nothing to indicate how logging the No Whisky planning area – in addition to logging other timber projects in the area – will meet water quality standards. Simply acknowledging that there have been timber projects in the past in the planning area, that there are currently projects ongoing in the planning area, and that projects are likely to take place in the planning area in the future, will not suffice. The EA failed to analyze these projects and their impacts on water quality. NEPA simply does not allow the agency to forgo a cumulative impacts analysis of these events. 40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.16 (environmental consequences), 1508.7 (cumulative impact).

The EA does not provide baseline data for water quality in the planning area. Without a scientific benchmark describing the condition of aquatic systems (measured in terms of temperature, turbidity, pH, fecal coliform, etc.), direct and indirect impacts cannot be determined. The analysis of existing conditions of the creeks and rivers in the planning area must be based on high quality science, and to adequately describe the current conditions of these aquatic systems, and necessitates accurately representing the impacts on these systems from the proposed action.<sup>6</sup> Beneficial uses in the watershed have been adversely affected by past management activities on federal and private lands.

Given this situation, the Forest Service acknowledges that the water quality, quantity, and timing within the watershed have been altered. Consequently, there is no support for the contention that “minimize the potential for sediment delivery” and a little more rigor is expected.

#### 4.1 The EA Lacks Required Quantitative and Qualitative Data on Water.

The EA failed to contain sufficient information surrounding the water quality in the planning area. A General Accounting Office study indicates that federal and state land management

---

<sup>6</sup> Impacts to watershed integrity from logging are described in numerous scientific articles. *See generally*, Jones and Grant 1996; Harr 1975; Harr 1979; Harr 1996; Wemple and Grant 1996; Beschta 1997; Beschta 1984; and Beschta and Taylor 1988.

decisions are limited by the lack of information about the aquatic systems at issue. (<http://www.gao.gov/archive/2000/rc00054.pdf>). There is no indication that the Mt. Hood National Forest has assessed the implications of this report or changed its management practices so as to comply with the recommendations in the GAO report. If adequate baseline data are missing, NFMA requires the agency to obtain it. 36 C.F.R. § 219.12(d). The Ninth Circuit has also held that “general statements about ‘possible’ effects and ‘some risk’ do not constitute a ‘hard look,’ absent a justification regarding why more definitive information could not be provided.” *Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain v. United States Forest Serv.*, 137 F.3d 1372, 1380 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998).

The EA failed to include sufficient information on stream conditions to satisfy this concern. In the alternative, the USFS should prepare an EIS to fully disclose and discuss the impacts to the environment from the proposed project. The failure to follow one of these courses of action will violate NEPA.

The regulations implementing the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) also require compliance with state water quality requirements. National Forest Management Act of 1976, 16 U.S.C. §§ 472a, 521b, 1600, 1611–1614 (1994 & Supp. III 1997) (amending Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, Pub. L. No. 93-378, 88 Stat. 476); 36 C.F.R. § 219.23(d). The courts have upheld this mandate. *Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project v. Blackwood*, 161 F.3d 1208, 1211 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998), *cert. denied*, *Ochoco Lumber Co. v. Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project*, 119 S.Ct. 2337 (1999). The USFS NEPA analysis must possess sufficient data to determine whether or not the streams in the planning area are meeting Oregon State standards, the USFS may violate NFMA if the No Whisky project is implemented. 36 C.F.R. § 219.23(d).

#### 4.2 Sedimentation Will Increase because of the No Whisky timber sale.

The EA failed to indicate the extent of impairment of water quality, and disclose the direct and cumulative impacts of the sale. The Ninth Circuit has held that “general statements about ‘possible’ effects and ‘some risk’ do not constitute a ‘hard look’ absent a justification regarding why more definitive information could not be provided.” *Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain v. United States Forest Serv.*, 137 F.3d 1372, 1380 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998).

The agency needs to quantify the extent of the sediment that will be produced as a result of the project: this information simply does not appear in the scoping letter. Instead, the agency claims – without proof – that the proposed mitigation measures will minimize any increases in sedimentation. If the USFS cannot assess the impacts to aquatic systems as a result of the proposed timber project, then NEPA demands that the agency prepare an environmental impact statement. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27 (requiring an EIS when the effects on the human environment are “highly uncertain or involve unique or known risks”).

##### 4.2.1 Direct impacts from sediment on the planning area.

The proposed project will contribute additional sediment to an already degraded aquatic system due to timber harvest and road construction and OHV use. These effects will be exacerbated by existing conditions. The Forest Service maintains that there would be minimal change in water quality with any of the alternatives. In addition to Riparian Reserve logging, landings and new temporary road construction within reserves would also introduce sediment to aquatic systems.

For the public and the decisionmaker to have a clear understanding of the project's effects on aquatic systems from sedimentation a number of hurdles must be cleared. First, there is needs to be rigorous "analysis" that discusses why the No Whisky project would only contribute limited amounts of sediment to the aquatic environment. Simply stating, as the scoping letter does, that it will be "minimized" without support in the record is not acceptable. Second, simply because the sedimentation input would be undetectable at the watershed scale<sup>7</sup> does not mean that there would not be a detectable input at the stream or project level. In fact increased sedimentation on a stream level from roads was found by bark volunteers in the first or second order stream between units 4 and 5.



Runoff from Rd4610 drains directly into tributary of North Fork Clackamas River.

This stream level sedimentation increase does in fact lead to a detectable (visual level) level of sedimentation input into the larger fish bearing rivers on the project or watershed scale.



High levels of sediment in tributary rushing into N. Fork Clackamas River.

Although it seems plain that the proposed project will *not* maintain or restore the

<sup>7</sup> The Forest Service's stand appears to refer to the 2004 ROD "clarifying" the applicability of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy to apply only at the watershed scale, and only at the distant temporal scale. Bark believes the 2004 ROD to be unlawful, and maintains that the ACS requires compliance with the nine ACS Objectives at each temporal and spatial scales. The No Whisky Project is likely to not meet these requirements.

sediment regime of the No Whisky planning area, the EA failed to demonstrate consistency with the ACS – especially for the activity proposed within Riparian Reserves – which prohibits changes in sediment regimes. Chance of landslides on steeper slopes in riparian reserves will increase if project goes through as planned. One landslide adjacent to the northern corner of unit 4 was also found by Bark volunteers. A flow of water was also found flowing out of the planning area and down the steep muddy cliff now formed as a result of the landslide and into the fish bearing N. fork.



Landslide adjacent to Unit 4 terminates in North Fork Clackamas River.

Implementation of projects that are inconsistent with the area forest plan violates NFMA. 16 U.S.C § 1604(i); 36 C.F.R. § 219.10(e). Such projects are arbitrary and capricious, and unlawful. 5 U.S.C. § 706(A)(2). If the USFS does not assess the impacts to aquatic systems from the proposed timber project, then NEPA demands that the agency prepare an environmental impact statement. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27 (requiring an EIS when the effects on the human environment are “highly uncertain or involve unique or known risks”).

Of particular concern is the increase in sedimentation as a result of road re/construction associated with the No Whisky timber sale. The Ochoco National Forest has indicated that “about two-thirds of the sediment delivered to streams from surface erosion comes from within 200 feet of the channel and more than 90 percent comes from within 400 feet.” *Hash Rock Environmental Assessment, Prineville Ranger District, Ochoco National Forest*, 52. The EA failed to identify this type of information, assess it in terms of the No Whisky project, or make a determination of how the proposed project will affect sediment delivery to all of the waterways in the planning area. The public and the MHNH needs to consider this type of information. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.24 (“methodology and scientific accuracy”).

Beyond assuring the public that there will be little possibility of sediment input to streams that are already heavily impacted, the EA failed to indicate the extent of impairment of water quality from the No Whisky sale, and disclose the direct and cumulative impacts of the project. The Ninth Circuit has held that “general statements about ‘possible’ effects and ‘some risk’ do not constitute a ‘hard look’ absent a justification regarding why more definitive information could not be provided.” *Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain v. United States Forest Serv.*, 137 F.3d 1372, 1380 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998).

Despite poor site conditions and vague predictions of effects from the No Whisky project, the USFS is proposing commercial logging in impaired areas rather than urgently needed restoration. The EA failed to include an adequate discussion of the effect that this project will have on sediment input in order to avoid having the USFS violate NFMA, which requires the agency to conserve aquatic resources. 36 C.F.R. § 219.27(a)(1). The failure to evaluate the impacts to aquatic systems from all potential sources of sediment violates NEPA, which requires the USFS

to assess the impacts of all activities associated with the proposed project in a single environmental document. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.16.

Moreover, the EA failed to discuss the cumulative sediment input because of the No Whisky timber sale and its associated actions to avoid having the USFS violate the Mt. Hood Forest Plan, which requires the USFS to drop projects that will not or do not meet Oregon water quality standards. If the proposed project violates Forest Plan standards, then the project will also violate NFMA's requirement that site-specific projects remain consistent with area forest plans. 16 U.S.C § 1604(i); 36 C.F.R. § 219.10(e).

#### 4.2.2 Cumulative impacts from sediment on the planning area.

It is clear from the scoping letter and other documentation that the No Whisky planning area has been dramatically affected by historic logging and roading. Significant additional impact had come more recently from illegal dumping and OHV use. However, other than explaining that this project is occurring, there is no actual analysis of how the effects of these activities combine to affect the environment. NEPA requires the agency to address the impacts "on the environment which result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions...cumulative impacts can result...by collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time." 40 C.F.R. § 1508.7. The courts have also held that the failure to conduct a cumulative impacts analysis is fatal to a project. *Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain v. United States Forest Serv.*, 137 F.3d 1372 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998); *Idaho Sporting Congress v. Thomas*, 137 F.3d 1146 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998); *Muckleshoot Indian Tribe v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 177 F.3d 800 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999).

Bark anticipates the Forest Service including in its cumulative impacts analysis a discussion of how ongoing logging projects, urban development, private land logging, and the proposed project all combine to affect the planning area. The Ninth Circuit has held that "general statements about 'possible' effects and 'some risk' do not constitute a 'hard look' absent a justification regarding why more definitive information could not be provided." *Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain v. United States Forest Serv.*, 137 F.3d 1372, 1380 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998).

#### 4.2.3 The EA failed to include adequate mitigation measures for aquatic systems.

Although the scoping letter lists several mitigation measures for the No Whisky timber sale, it does not indicate whether these measures are required in the timber project contract, how it intends to ensure compliance with the measures if they are in fact required, or whether these measures will be effective. Such detail would not be expected in a scoping letter, but will be expected in a more detailed NEPA analysis. Additionally, it is expected that there will be a report on how enforcement will be funded or what the agency will do if it discovers that the BMPs are not properly functioning. NEPA requires the USFS to include in the environmental analysis a discussion of all aspects of a proposed project, including mitigation plans. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(f). The courts have held that the USFS is obligated to detail in a detailed NEPA

analysis the mitigation measures for the project. *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizen's Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 353 (1989).

#### 4.2.4 The reliance on Best Management Practices (BMPs) is insufficient mitigation for sediment impacts to aquatic systems.

The USFS claims that the direct sediment input from timber harvest in addition to any other sources of sediment will be sufficiently mitigated by the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) and a 30 foot or less no-cut buffer. While the use of BMPs is to be encouraged in timber projects, Bark note that the use of these measures are not themselves sufficient to ensure compliance with the Clean Water Act (CWA). *Northwest Indian Cemetery Protective Ass'n v. Peterson* 795 F.2d 688, 697 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986) (holding that compliance with BMPs does not equate to compliance with the CWA). BMPs are simply a method of management practices, not mitigation measures themselves. Indeed, the USFS assumes that the implementation of BMPs will sufficiently mitigate any problems that the proposed project will have on aquatic systems, but offers no proof of this assertion. Consequently, this assumption is flawed and violates the law.

#### 4.2.5 The No Whisky timber sale needs to include a monitoring requirement or a mechanism to deal with water quality violations.

The EA failed to state whether water quality impacts will be monitored to ensure that water quality standards are met, when this evaluation will occur, or what the USFS intends to do if the effects on aquatic systems are greater than anticipated. The courts have held that all analysis of the effects of a project must be assessed in the contemporary environmental document. *City of Tenakee Springs v. Clough*, 915 F.2d 1308, 1313 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990). Bark points out that the USFS was required to conduct comprehensive monitoring on other timber projects in order to assure that water quality standards were being met, and the MHFP requires monitoring to assure that site-specific projects comply with the Mt. Hood Forest Plan. However, the USFS has failed to conduct *systematic and methodical* monitoring in the past, and is unlikely to do so in this case.

#### 4.2.6 The No Whisky timber sale is flawed because it requires the construction of nearly 8000' of road.

For this project, approximately 8000 feet of road will be re/constructed to access the proposed harvest units. Bark has numerous and long-standing concerns regarding road construction and water quality. One of our most significant concerns regarding this project – as well as others on the Forest – is the Forest Service's practice of re/constructing considerable road mileage as part of timber harvest, but failing to account for the environmental impact of this road work. In particular, the Forest Service frequently proposed road re/construction as part of timber harvest and states that the road removal (including closure, decommissioning, etc.) will take place immediately after logging is complete, but fails to actually undertake this work post-project.

Regardless of the reason – lack of funding, enforcement, or initiative – the Forest Service cannot legally or ecologically continue to delay effective road removal.

#### 4.2.6.1 Road re/construction will contribute to sedimentation in the planning area.

The Forest Service concedes that roads and timber harvest are major contributors of sediment input to streams. *North Fork Clackamas Watershed Analysis*, 2-7. Given the existing open road density in the planning area and the degradation those roads are causing, Bark finds the “need” to build more roads disingenuous. The agency is likely to fail to demonstrate that building more roads will benefit the water quality in the planning area, as required by the Northwest Forest Plan. Until the Forest Service can meet these requirements, the No Whisky project should be withdrawn.

#### 4.2.6.2 Undemonstrated ability to close roads.

While both action alternatives would also close some roads, the MHNF has a poor record of successfully closing roads and restoring them to a hydrologically stable condition. Despite the current high road density and the certain degradation that existing open, “closed,” and new roads will cause, the USFS failed to address this issue in the EA. *Sierra Club v. Morton*, 510 F.2d 813, 824 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1975) (requiring the agency to “disclose the history of success and failure of similar projects”). Instead, the USFS relies on closing roads as mitigation for impairment that the No Whisky project will cause. Road closure in the past has been haphazard at best and rarely effective on the MHNF. *Bark Road Closure Report*.

The USFS offers no assurances in the scoping letter that the roads slated for closure in conjunction with the No Whisky project will actually occur. In addition, the USFS does not indicate how it intends to compensate for the short- and long-term damage to the watershed caused by reconstructing, upgrading, and building roads in subwatersheds that already have an excessive road density. The project should not go forward until the USFS can ensure compliance with the applicable standards designed to protect water quality.

#### 4.2.6.3 “Temporary” road construction and road reconstruction result in new system road and associated impacts.

The EA notes that roads will be reconstructed to facilitate timber harvest. Road reconstruction includes activities such as cutting and disposal of roadway vegetation; replacement of culverts; placement of rip-rap material; recondition of roadbeds; and placing aggregate on some road surfaces. In addition, “road closure” also includes water-barring, pulling of culverts, scarification to a depth of 12 inches, and seeding. Bark points out the similarity between road reconstruction and temporary road closure. Reconstruction involves the same activities as road closure, which suggests that closing roads and reconstructing them have similar impacts to the environment.

#### 4.2.6.4 Road density.

The Forest Plan specifies that the open road density for large game wintering areas (which encompasses the planning area) must not exceed 1.5 -2 miles/miles<sup>2</sup> (B-10 vs. general Winter Range), even though scientific literature recommends a density of less than 1 mile/mile<sup>2</sup>. The North Fork Clackamas Watershed Analysis shows a variety of road densities depending on the subwatershed. Bark remains very concerned about both road densities that exceed LRMP levels as well as any planned road construction within areas that already exceed the LRMP levels.

As stated previously, the MHNH has a poor record of actually closing roads. Consequently, Bark is not assuaged that the road density in the planning area – which violates LRMP standards – will be reduced. This project should not go forward because it violates LRMP standards for open road density. 16 U.S.C § 1604(i); 36 C.F.R. § 219.10(e).

Furthermore, Bark points out that the Northwest Forest Plan requires the Forest Service to “reduce existing system and *nonsystem* road mileage.” [emphasis added] S&Gs, C-7; B-19. The No Whisky project fails to comply with this mandate.

#### 4.2.6.5 Illegal road network.

Historically uncontrolled OHV use on the No Whisky project area has created large and very destructive network of illegal roads. The Clackamas River Ranger District has demonstrated an inability to control illegal OHV use in this area. New road construction and road reconstruction will just exacerbate this issue. The EA failed to address this issue directly. While examining legalizing and promoting the OHV use in the area via the current USFS proposal (<http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/mthood/projects/ohv-routes/07-05-ladee811.pdf>) is a start, it doesn't actually address the illegal road network that currently exists and it is this network that would be expanded via new road re/construction.

The EA doesn't directly address the illegal OHV use or the ghost roads created by the illegal OHV use. While the EA does speak to making temporary roads (both new and re-used) and skid trails impassible by OHVs there is no systematic cataloging of the existing illegal roads. Failure to address this issue violates the NFP.

The EA doesn't directly address the illegal OHV use of closed/bermed system roads. Failure to address this issue violates the NFP.

#### 4.3 Riparian Reserve timber harvest.

The Riparian Reserve harvest plans in the No Whisky sale ignores the recommendations of the Clackamas River Basin Action Plan, Appendix A: Summary of Recommendations from the Mt. Hood National Forest (and BLM) Watershed Assessments and violates the LRMP, NEPA, NFP (including both S&M and ACS) and the Endangered Species Act.

The recommendations of the Clackamas River Basin Action Plan specifically sites as concerns roads (in this case illegal OHV created roads) in Riparian Reserves (under travel management) and monitoring sediment production from OHV use. The No Whisky EA ignores both of these recommendations.

Unaddressed damage from skidtrails within the Riparian Reserves violates the LRMP [Four-49, FW-024]. Rutting within skid trails should not exceed 12 inches in depth over more than 10% of a designated skidtrail system. There was no mention of monitoring for this Forest-wide guideline nor is there any mention of any BMP that specifically addresses this LRMP issue. Skid trails for ground-based equipment would be designed to meet Mt. Hood Forest Plan standards for soils is an unfounded assertion. Once again, this has not been monitored in the past and this constitutes a groundless assertion. If there has been monitoring for this (e.g., FW-024), the documentation needs to be cited. Further violations of the LRMP are found in the unaddressed issue of OHV use within Riparian Reserves, [Four-280, B11-037] states that recreational motorized vehicle activity shall not be permitted except on open roads and designated parking areas.

The inconsistent use of the term “no-harvest” and “no-cut” in reference to intermittent and riparian stream buffers (for example p. 14, 29) leaves the public unable to adequately or accurately comment on this plan. This violates NEPA.

The logging plan for the Riparian Areas is not adequately differentiated from the logging plan of the Matrix. Simply having a heavier thin and stream buffers does not constitute a sufficient plan to treat the Riparian Reserves in order to restore them to functioning late-seral conditions and this constitutes a violation of the ACS. The lack of a coherent and explicit plan to deal with the degrading effects of *current* OHV abuse within Riparian Reserves of the No Whisky project area further violates the ACS. Detrimental soil conditions, a problem in over 65% of the sale, is not explicitly addressed by the No Whisky EA for the Riparian Reserve logging. This failure to explicitly address this issue constitutes a violation of the ACS.

The inconsistent use of the term “no-harvest” and “no-cut” in reference to riparian stream buffers for the S&M and Sensitive aquatic mollusk *Lyogyrus* (p. 20, 36) clearly violates both the S&M and ESA requirements.

The No Whisky EA violates NFP S&G B-14 by failing to accurately identify wetlands as demonstrated by the boundary marker directly above a wetlands dominated by sedges on the western boundary of unit 12a.

While road BMP 7.2 deals with landings in Riparian Reserves, it does not indicate if re-used existing landings within the Riparian Reserves will be obliterated after use. Since one of the arguments for the heavier thin in the Riparian Reserve is to allow for single entry and thereby reduce the disturbance of the Reserve there will be no future need for the newly created landing within the Reserve and it should be obliterated and replanted. While the EA does state that landings in units with detrimental soil conditions over the Forest Plan standards would be obliterated, no specific mention of landings within Riparian Reserves is made. Further, no

indication of other damaging procedures (burning of slash, collection of firewood, etc.) will be allowed to occur within the Reserve landings.

The No Whisky project proposes a 30' or less no harvest buffer on intermittent streams. This is unacceptable and the lack of citations in support of this designation makes it arbitrary and capricious. The reduced streamside buffer increases sedimentation and stream "flashiness" as these streams boom-and-bust without an adequate streamside buffer. The need for at least a 50' no-cut buffer intermittent streams is further encouraged by the needs of the streamside microclimate as described within the Highlights of Science, Contributions to Implementing the Northwest Forest Plan 1994-1998 by Nancy M. Diaz and Richard W. Haynes. They went on to explicitly state: "The importance of intermittent streams was further underscored by studies that showed they often tend to be "hot spots" for biological diversity and critical source areas for organisms and organic matter to restore downstream areas affected by floods." The recommendations and observations found in PNW Science Findings Issue 53, May 2003 where they found that thin buffers had depressed amphibian populations even 60 years after the harvest and that narrow buffers "...did not ameliorate the effects of logging the adjacent stand" further underscore the need for a larger intermittent stream buffer than is currently proposed.

As noted in "The Effects of Buffer Strip Width on Air Temperature and Relative Humidity in a Stream Riparian Zone," (Tyler Ledwith, Hydrologist, Six Rivers National Forest, Eureka, CA 1996), there was a significant increase in the rate of air temperature warming and reduction in relative humidity based on the width of the riparian buffer. He noted that "much of the data on buffer strips, including this study, indicates that a minimum buffer width of 30 meters (~100 feet) is necessary to avoid significantly impacting riparian environments (*Erman et al. 1977; Steinblums 1977; Rudolph and Dickson 1990; Chen 1991; Spackman and Hughes 1994*). Further buffer zone implications were found with an examination of nesting birds within buffer strips of different sizes which found buffer strips under 45' were not able to maintain the pre-logging bird community (BREEDING BIRD RESPONSE TO RIPARIAN BUFFER WIDTH IN MANAGED PACIFIC NORTHWEST DOUGLAS-FIR FORESTS, SCOTT F. PEARSON, DAVID A. MANUWAL, 2001). This microclimate data is supported in the study "Harvesting Effects on Microclimatic Gradients from Small Streams to Uplands in Western Washington", KD Brososke, J Chen, RJ Naiman, JF Franklin - Ecological Applications, 1997.

As noted in "The inadequacy of the fish-bearing criterion for stream management," (Kenneth W. Cummins and Margaret A. Wilzbach, 2004), "the importance of intermittent, ephemeral, and very small first order channels as suppliers of invertebrates and detritus to permanently flowing, receiving streams that support juvenile salmonids warrant their protection during timber harvest." Relegating intermittent stream buffers to 30' or less clearly ignores the current and accumulating science on this subject and is capricious and arbitrary.

Ziemer and Lisle (1993) stated that there are no reliable data indicating that BMPs are cumulatively effective in protecting aquatic resources from the adverse effects of logging and associated impacts. Espinosa et al. (1997) provided evidence from watershed case histories that BMPs thoroughly failed to cumulatively protect salmonid habitats and streams from severe damage from roads and logging.

Ziemer, R.R., and Lisle, T.E., 1993. Evaluating sediment production by activities related to forest uses--A Northwest Perspective. Proceedings: Technical Workshop on Sediments, Feb., 1992, Corvallis, Oregon. pp. 71-74.

Espinosa, F.A., Rhodes, J.J., and McCullough, D.A.. 1997. The failure of existing plans to protect salmon habitat on the Clearwater National Forest in Idaho. *Journal of Environmental Management*. 49: 205-230.

#### 4.3.1 Undemonstrated need for riparian reserve harvest.

The No Whisky project proposes riparian reserve harvest, including yarding. The Northwest Forest Plan permits timber harvest in riparian reserves only when needed to meet ACS Objectives. *S&Gs*, C-32. However, since the USFS has not demonstrated whether the streams affected by this activity are meeting the ACS, or how logging in riparian areas will contribute to meeting the ACSOs, it is unproven whether or not this timber harvest is appropriate.

The EA failed to justify the proposed riparian reserve timber harvest in the No Whisky planning area and is in violation of NEPA. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.24. Proceeding without adequate justification is arbitrary and capricious, and violates the AEA. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

#### 4.3.2 Commercial extraction from riparian reserves.

The NFP allows for timber harvest in riparian reserves only to meet the objectives of the ACS. *S&Gs*, C-32. However, the Forest Service is proposing riparian reserve harvest for commercial extraction. The scoping letter notes that the MHNF “proposes a commercial timber harvest”

Bark does not understand the intent of the Forest Service. If logging within riparian reserves is for the purpose of increasing retained tree diameter and for stocking control, then this purpose is belied by the commercial value of the trees that are removed from the riparian area. If the purpose is to “cherry pick” large trees out of the riparian reserves, then this activity violates the NFP.

#### 4.4 Peak Flows May Increase because of the No Whisky timber sale.

In addressing the peak flow issue, the Forest Service turns to a watershed disturbance model. This model will indicate that the planning area is “more stable and not affected by rain on snow events.” Historically, the model will not include other ownerships such as BLM or private lands. Given that the watershed is intertwined with these land ownerships – many of which have clear cut all of their holdings – it is irresponsible to only consider forested National Forest land in the agency’s analysis of changes to peak flow. Specifically, “Bedford Creek, Bee Creek, and Fall Creek subwatersheds are likely to have more potential sediment delivery...due to some information gaps on private land.” *North Fork Clackamas Watershed Analysis*, 2-9. Because NEPA requires the Forest Service to assess the cumulative effects of federal and nonfederal actions in conjunction with the proposed project, the Forest Service must also assess how activities conducted by other owners in the same watershed will affect the planning area. Bark

requested that the subsequent NEPA analysis include peak flow analysis run with the effects of BLM and private ownership included in the model and this was not provided.

#### 4.5 Impacts on fish not adequately analyzed and ACS requirements not met

The North Fork Watershed Analysis indicates that there are several species of listed fish present in, or immediately downstream from, the planning area including chinook and coho. Many other fish species' populations are depressed or at risk of extinction. The EA failed to avoid the traditional Forest Service conclusion that even though the planning area is "functioning at risk" or "functioning at unacceptable risk" for several parameters related to fish habitat and survival, the proposed project nonetheless will not adversely affect listed and non-listed fish species.

As stated previously, the courts have repeatedly held that this type of finding precludes implementation of the project because the project's effects violate the ACS. *Pacific Coast Fed'n of Fishermen's Assn's v. National Marine Fisheries Serv.*, 71 F. Supp. 2d 1063 (W.D. Wash. 1999), *aff'd*, *Pacific Coast Fed'n of Fishermen's Assn's v. National Marine Fisheries Serv.*, 265 F.3d 1028 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001). Indeed, the courts have also recently held that when the water quality in the planning area is not meeting state water quality standards, and when the proposed project will contribute to the degradation of water quality and fish viability, the project violates the Clean Water Act. *Sierra Club v. Austin*, No. CV-03-22-M-SWM (D. Mont. Apr. 30, 2003); 33 U.S.C. § 1323.

Because it is clear from the scoping letter that the No Whisky timber sale will contribute to aquatic degradation, it is reasonable to assume that fish and their habitat will be degraded as well. This violates the ACS, which in terms violates NFMA. 16 U.S.C § 1604(i); 36 C.F.R. § 219.10(e); 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

#### 5 No Whisky EA Fails to adequately analyze the impact to wildlife.

The EA failed to adequately identify impacts that the sale would have on a number of wildlife species (including threatened and sensitive species) by removing the trees associated with this project. Consequently, the USFS must ensure that it is providing for the viability for the species in the planning area. 36 C.F.R. §§ 219.19, 219.26.

##### 5.1 The Mt. Hood National Forest has failed to survey for sensitive and listed species and therefore lacks the necessary information on which to base further NEPA analysis for the No Whisky timber sale.

Bark does not believe that the MHNH has to survey for every species that may be present in a project area in order to satisfy NEPA analysis. However, surveys for sensitive, listed, proposed for listing/rare, and management indicator species that have been reported or are likely to utilize the project area should be conducted if reliable population estimates are not available. OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL, FOREST SERVICE TIMBER SALE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS REQUIREMENTS, EVALUATION REPORT NO. 08801-10-AT, 20 (1999). Such monitoring is required under NFMA, and NEPA requires the agency to use only high quality science and to obtain data

when it is missing yet necessary to make an informed decision. 36 C.F.R. § 219.27(a)(6); 40 C.F.R. §§ 1503.24 (scientific accuracy), 1502.22 (incomplete or unavailable information). The failure to complete such monitoring means that the data are not collected, and the approximate population levels or trends of species on the Forest are unknown. Without such data, the MHNH lacks the informed ability to provide adequate NEPA analysis, in violation of NEPA. 40 C.F.R. § 1500.1.

The EA asserts, “None of the proposed harvest units provide habitat for these species.” (p 62) This statement is simply false and demonstrates the problem with not actually surveying for species. On various visits to proposed units 4, 12a, 21, and 34 Bark noted pileated woodpecker holes. The EA goes on, “No further analysis necessary due to lack of habitat.” Bark expects the EA to analyze the impacts of No Whisky on pileated woodpeckers.

This is problematic for several reasons. First, it is impossible for the agency to adequately prepare a NEPA analysis without fully examining significant impacts to listed or proposed species when it fails to analyze the project in terms of historical management impacts to these species. Simply pretending that these species may or may not exist in the planning area does not alleviate the agency’s duties under the Endangered Species Act. Endangered Species Act of 1973, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1531-1544 (1994).

Second, the Endangered Species Act (ESA) requires the USFS to use the best available scientific and commercial data in assessing the impacts to species, which includes surveying for them. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2). Since population studies are likely lacking for the No Whisky planning area, the USFS is precluded from determining that the project is not likely to adversely affect the listed species under section 7 of the ESA. *Id.* § 1536(b). Basing a decision on “non-information” is unreasonable and violates the Administrative Procedure Act (AEA). 5 U.S.C. § 706.

Third, impacts to wildlife species in the short and midterm are not insignificant, and the agency traditionally fails to assess what these impacts would be. Because habitat will not be available for many years post-project, it is unclear how wildlife species will be affected in the meantime (although habitat conditions can be expected to have been degraded). Again, NFMA does not recognize this outcome as legally acceptable.

The No Whisky project would cause nonlisted species to trend towards listing, and listed species to trend toward jeopardy. Northern spotted owls and some salmon species are species about which the District lacks adequate information to conclude that the proposed project would not make their populations trend downwards, in violation of the ESA. *Sierra Club v. Martin*, 168 F.3d 1 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999). There is no evidence to support the conclusion that removing what remains of suitable habitat for wildlife species will benefit them. Indeed, the facts suggest that these species will be adversely affected in the short and long term.

## 5.2 Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive species.

It is the stated policy of Congress that all Federal departments and agencies “shall seek to conserve endangered species and threatened species and shall utilize their authorities in

furtherance of [this] purpose.” Endangered Species Act of 1973, 16 U.S.C. § 1531(c)(1). The Supreme Court has clearly restated congressional policy stating that, “The plain intent of Congress in enacting this statute was to halt and reverse the trend toward species extinction, whatever the cost.” *Tennessee Valley Authority v. Hill*, 437 U.S. 153, 184 (1978). A USFS decision to proceed with the No Whisky timber sale would be inconsistent with the congressional mandate of the ESA.

Under the ESA, the Forest Service has the responsibility to “insure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by such agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of habitat of such species.” 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a). As described *infra*, the EA failed to support the finding that the proposed sale would not likely adversely affect at least northern spotted owls, and anadromous fish. The proposed sale would significantly exacerbate the degraded habitat conditions for these species that already exists on the MHNF. The near absence of any information from surveys or monitoring of listed species makes a reasonable analysis of how this project and others proposed will cumulatively affect these species impossible.

## 5.2.1 Northern spotted owl.

### 5.2.1.1 Lack of current spotted owl population baseline for the Mt. Hood National Forest precludes implementation of the No Whisky timber sale.

To avoid the taking or otherwise jeopardizing of listed species and/or the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat, the ESA creates a process whereby all federal action agencies must consult with the FWS before the action agency engages in actions that may affect critical habitat or a threatened or endangered species that may be present in the project area. 16 U.S.C. §§ 1536(a)(2). The action agency – here, the USFS – must prepare a biological assessment that describes the anticipated impacts to the target species because of the project. *Id.* § 1536(c)(1). FWS then must issue a biological opinion that “shall...[e]nsure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by such agency...is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of [critical] habitat.” *Id.* §§ 1536(a); (b).

As part of a biological opinion, the FWS must quantify the extent of the incidental take and the effect that the proposed action will have on a listed species’ critical habitat. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(b)(4)(A)(i); (B)(i). To this end, the FWS must consider the impacts to the listed species from the proposed action in conjunction with past and present actions: the “effects of the action.” 50 C.F.R. §§ 402.14(g)(2) – (4); 402.02. In nearly all cases of consultation on the MHNF, FWS has adopted the USFS’s biological assessment as FWS’s determination of effect on the listed species.

The FWS has an affirmative obligation to independently assess the status of the spotted owl, as well as the proposed project’s effect on the species. Consistently deferring to the USFS’s assessment of that agency’s impact to a listed species vitiates the consultation requirement of the

ESA. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(b). Similarly, the Forest Service violates its own ESA requirement to independently ensure against jeopardy of a listed species and to use its authority to conserve listed species when it fails to require the FWS to adequately assess a proposed project's impacts to those species. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(b).

The condition of the species and its habitat prior to the proposed action is known as the “environmental baseline” for the species. 50 C.F.R. § 402.02. The environmental baseline “includes all past and present impacts of all Federal, State, or private actions and other human activities in the action area; the anticipated impacts of all proposed Federal projects in the action area that have already undergone formal or early section 7 consultation; and the impact of State or private actions which are contemporaneous with the consultation in progress.” 50 C.F.R. § 402.02. Without an adequate environmental baseline, FWS has no way of evaluating the present status of a listed species, and thus cannot rationally decide whether additional impacts on the species may not jeopardize its continued existence.

The failure to make a population-based analysis creates a significant level of uncertainty regarding the level of impact that this project will have on owls in the planning area, adjacent roadless areas, and nearby lands. NEPA requires that when data are not available an agency should recognize the lack of data and explain why obtaining it was not feasible. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22. The ESA prohibits the Forest Service from going forward with the proposed sale without ensuring that the project will not result in jeopardy to the species. In light of this an EIS should have been prepared that addresses population trends in relation to No Whisky and adjacent sales.

5.2.1.2 Direct and indirect impact to spotted owls precludes implementation of the No Whisky timber sale.

5.2.1.2.1 Programmatic consultation is unlawful absent site-specific consultation on project effects.

The Forest Service has inappropriately tiered to a programmatic biological opinion for spotted owls in support of its conclusion that this project will have no effects on the spotted owl. In *Pacific Rivers Council v. Thomas*, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals held that not only does the ESA require the Forest Service and National Marine Fisheries Service to consult on site-specific timber sales, but also on the larger management plan that directed where the site-specific actions would be allowed to occur. *Pacific Rivers Council v. Thomas*, 30 F.3d 1050 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994). Similarly, in *Connor v. Burford*, the Ninth Circuit held that “incremental consultation” on oil and gas leases was unlawful, because it deferred consultation to later stages in development of the resource and therefore obscured the cumulative impacts to listed species. *Connor v. Burford*, 848 F.2d 1441 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988). The court explained that

The biological opinions of the FWS, which concluded that leasing itself was not likely to jeopardize the protected species, did not assess the potential impact that post-leasing oil and gas activities might have on protected species. Rather, the FWS opinions relied on

“incremental-step consultation,” contemplating that additional biological evaluations would be prepared prior to all subsequent activities and that lessees’ development proposal would be modified to protect species.

*Id.* at 1452. As it did in *Pacific Rivers*, the Ninth Circuit in *Connor* required the FWS to prepare not only a comprehensive biological opinion on the USFS’s oil and gas leasing program, but also on subsequent leases themselves.

The court also addressed this issue in *North Slope Borough v. Andrus*, 515 F. Supp. 961 (D.C. Cir. 1981). There the DC court distinguished the Outer Continental Shelf Leasing Act (OCSLA) – which specifically allows for segmentation of projects by statute – from the Mineral Leasing Act (MLA), at issue in *North Slope*. The court explained that the OCSLA was not incompatible with the ESA, because the statute provided for “checks and balances,” which were absent in the MLA statute. The court was clear that the ESA will allow incremental consultation only when provided as such by the authorizing statute; in the absence of such allowance, consultation at the programmatic and site-specific level is required. In this case, there is no authorization in any underlying statute that would permit incremental consultation.

In *Lane County Audubon Society v. Jamison*, the Ninth Circuit confronted a similar issue to that in *Pacific Rivers*. *Lane County Audubon Soc’y v. Jamison*, 958 F.2d 290 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992). In *Lane County*, the BLM failed to consult with FWS on the Jamison Strategy, which set aside some old growth habitat but allowed much of the remaining habitat to be logged, and instead consulted on individual timber sales implemented pursuant to the Strategy. The court opined that “the impact of each individual sale on owl habitat cannot be measured without reference to the management criteria established” at programmatic levels. *Id.* at 316. Moreover,

Certainly a full accounting for impacts must be *cumulative as well as project specific*, and in particular circumstances...that assessment may not be made with confidence. It is also true that decisions made at the planning level may have significant effects if implemented over time, a good reason for requiring consultation at this stage. However, no automatic judgment can be made that individual projects will undermine typically general and long run planning options. Where there is a reasonable basis for concluding that individual and cumulative impacts of a project are unlikely to prejudice a species of concern, significant programmatic error is remote.

*Id.* at 317.

The District Court for the Western District of Washington squarely addressed the scope of analysis issue in *Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen’s Association v. National Marine Fisheries Service* (1999). *Pacific Coast Fed. of Fishermen’s Ass’n v. National Marine Fisheries Serv.*, 71 F. Supp.2d 1063 (W.D. Wash. 1999). In that case – the second of three eventual challenges to 24 timber sale biological opinions – the court struck down NMFS’ attempt to offset the short-term, site-specific impacts of old growth logging by claiming that the impacts would be nonexistent at the watershed scale (even if very evident at the site), and that “passive

restoration”<sup>8</sup> would minimize any adverse effects from timber harvest. Specifically, the agency argued that timber harvest was consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy (ACS) of the Northwest Forest Plan, and that because the ACS was designed to protect listed fish species pursuant to the ESA, compliance with the NWFP was compliance with the ESA. *Id.* at 1068.

The court accepted NMFS’ contention that compliance with the Plan equaled compliance with the ESA, but subsequently held that the agency had not complied with the ACS in permitting the degradation of water quality and fish habitat at the stream level. The court agreed with the plaintiffs’ contention that “focusing on so large a landscape [in consultation] masks each sales’ impacts...by focusing on the watershed level, NMFS has ensured that few if any projects will create sufficient degradation at the watershed level to be deemed inconsistent with the ACS.” 71 F. Supp.2d at 1069.

The EA failed to indicate why tiering this project to a programmatic BiOp is appropriate, or legal. In previous sales the Forest Service has made the same argument that the courts found unlawful in *Pacific Rivers, Connor, North Slope Borough, Jamison, and Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen’s Association*. The agency has previously maintained that so long as a programmatic biological opinion has been prepared that addresses the same type of activities that may occur on a site-specific basis, and it has completed the “programmatic biological assessment project consistency forms,” the USFS has met its ESA obligations. However, this approach does not take into consideration the site-specific particularities of the No Whisky planning area, the management history of the area, or the status of the species in the planning area, and therefore violates the ESA and is arbitrary and capricious. 16 U.S.C. § 1536; 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

#### 5.2.1.2.2 Removal of dispersal habitat.

In addition to severing connectivity corridors and removing suitable habitat, the proposed sale is likely to remove dispersal habitat from the planning area. Bark has several concerns with this approach. As stated earlier, the planning area is severely lacking in connective habitat. Given this situation, the Forest Service appears to be unreasonably promoting a project that will exacerbate an already fragmented landscape that is contributing to the decline of a listed species. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A); 16 U.S.C. § 1536(b). Regardless of whether dispersal (connective) habitat is “declining,” because it is critical to the survival of the owl in the planning area, the Forest Service has an affirmative obligation to preserve this habitat. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a). While the EA acknowledges that the analysis area is surrounded by a Late Successional Reserve, it does not make clear in the following note whether it is referring to the No Whisky project area or the much larger NSO analysis area:

The dispersal habitat currently present in the analysis area is likely an important means of connectivity between these suitable habitats that surround the area (USDA 1996).

The Forest Service must not fail to assess how the No Whisky project will affect the spotted owls in the project area. Because the agency is likely to rely on a programmatic BiOp for this project,

---

<sup>8</sup> NMFS argued that the adverse effects of logging trees would be mitigated by the positive effects of trees regrowing in the same vicinity of the timber sale. The agency called this effect “passive restoration.”

and because the programmatic BiOp does not consider the site-specificity of the No Whisky project, it is impossible for the Forest Service to explain to the public how this project will affect the species. For example, the EA failed to avoid statements such as those on found in the South Fork EA “effects to spotted owl on a province scale (Willamette Province)” and a paragraph on “effects to spotted owl on the entire range of the species (Washington, Oregon, and California);” No Whisky EA needed to show how the project will affect the spotted owls in the No Whisky planning area. This is what NEPA, and the ESA require.

Bark is cognizant that programmatic approval from FWS to implement a project indicates that FWS has determined that the project will not lead to jeopardy of the species. However, as stated previously, neither FWS nor the USFS have the environmental baseline to make an accurate assessment of whether the No Whisky sale will in fact lead to jeopardy of the owl. We therefore expect that the No Whisky sale will be modified in such a manner as to protect all dispersal, NRF, and interior forest habitat.

#### 5.2.1.3 Project design failure.

Bark understands that the Forest Service must make a difficult decision regarding the design of the No Whisky timber sale in terms of aggressive silviculture and spotted owl viability. However, when such a management decision must be made, the ESA compels conservation of listed species over treating some overstocked forested areas. Consequently, the USFS failed to design No Whisky to reverse the downward spotted owl population trend. Bark questions the prudence of a timber sale that results in the potential incidental take of spotted owls (does the Forest Service know how many owls live in the project area?) as well as the degradation of the critical habitat.

Bark does not contest that the NFP recognized that spotted owl numbers would continue to decline. However, we remain unconvinced by any scientific evidence that the MHNF is *not* contributing to the decrease in the viability of this species across the species’ range. Moreover, we maintain that the ESA – which is stronger authority than the NFP or NFMA – in fact prohibits knowing participation in this decline. Bark has repeatedly requested scientific data that support the conclusion that timber harvest practices on the MHNF are not contributing to the loss of habitat for the spotted owl, consistent with the ESA and NFMA. However, this confirmation has not been forthcoming. Therefore, Bark can only assume that no such data exist, and that the Forest is operating in direct opposition to the ESA and NFMA.

#### 5.2.1.4 Interspecies competition.

Bark is also concerned that the Forest Service has failed to assess the effects of interspecies competition on spotted owl viability. Notably, the NFP and its EIS did not assess how spotted owls would be impacted by interspecies competition: it only addressed the impacts to the species because of habitat loss.

The FWS has recognized the importance of interspecies competition with spotted owls, and the role that barred owls play in spotted owl survival. *A Range Wide Baseline Summary and Evaluation of Data Collected through Section 7 Consultation for the Northern Spotted Owl and its Critical Habitat: 1994-2001*, 11. This document, prepared in response to litigation and dated June 26, 2001, should be incorporated into the administrative record in its entirety by this reference. In it, the FWS states that “the barred owls’ increasing expansion into the range of the spotted owl may eventually pose a serious threat” to spotted owl survival. *Id.* The mainstream media have also raised the question of interspecies competition and spotted owl viability.

Indeed, it is clear that past timber harvest has led to the increase in barred owl populations in the planning area. Forest Service statements, such as this from the nearby South Fork EA,

The barred owl has been expanding into northern spotted owl territory from northeastern Canada since about 1900, moving into Washington, Oregon and Northern California and in some cases has been displacing spotted owls. Barred owls are known to be present on the Forest. Barred owls may be expanding their range because of changes to forest structure from logging, wildfire, or climate change.

does not assess how barred owls, in addition to the No Whisky project, will affect spotted owls. This uncertainty should have been enough to compel the Forest Service to complete an EIS.

### 5.3 Management Indicator Species.

NFMA requires the Forest Service to ensure animal and plant diversity in the national forests. 16 U.S.C. § 1604(g)(3)(B). USFS regulations implementing this requirement direct the Forest Service to manage forests for viable populations of native vertebrate and desired non-native species. 36 C.F.R. § 219.19. The regulations define viable populations as a population that has “the estimated numbers and distribution of reproductive individuals to insure its continued existence is well distributed in the planning area.” *Id.*

To ensure that viable populations are maintained, the Forest Service regulations also require that the Service identify management indicator species (MIS) and that “[p]opulation trends of the management indicator species will be monitored and relationships to habitat change determined.” 36 C.F.R. § 219.19(a)(6). This monitoring is “essential to verify and, if necessary, modify the forest plan’s assumptions about the effects of timber harvesting and other management activities on wildlife...In order to meet the monitoring requirement, planners will need to obtain adequate inventories of wildlife populations and distribution.” Charles F. Wilkinson and H. Michael Anderson, *Land and Resource Planning in the National Forests*, 304 (1987).

The Ninth Circuit has stated that the duty to ensure viable or self-sustaining populations “applies with special force to “sensitive” species.” *Inland Empire Public Lands Council v. United States Forest Serv.*, 88 F.3d 754 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996) (citing *Oregon Natural Resources Council v. Lowe*, 836 F.Supp 727, 733 (D.Or. 1993)). NFMA clearly directs the Forest Service to create regulations to “insure research on and (based on continuous monitoring and assessment in the field) evaluation of the effects of each management system to the end that it will not produce substantial and

permanent impairment of the productivity of the land.” 16 U.S.C. § 1604(g)(3)(C); *Sierra Club v. Martin*, 168 F.3d 1 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999).

In light of this direction, NFMA’s regulations require inventorying and monitoring on the National Forests under 36 C.F.R. §§ 219.12(d) and (k) as well as 36 C.F.R. §§ 219.19(a)(6), 219.26, and 219.19(a)(2). The regulations state “each Forest Supervisor shall obtain and keep current inventory data appropriate for planning and managing the resources under his or her administrative jurisdiction.” *Id.* § 219.12(d). The regulations further require that “at intervals established in the plan, implementation shall be evaluated on a sample basis to determine how well objectives have been met and how closely management standards and guidelines have been applied.” *Id.* § 219.12(k). To ensure biological diversity, the regulations specifically require that “[i]nventories shall include quantitative data making possible the evaluation of diversity in terms of its prior and present condition.” *Id.* § 219.26.

Although NFMA clearly requires the monitoring of MIS populations, the Forest Service has traditionally relied upon the availability of suitable MIS habitat, rather than population surveys, to meet NFMA’s viable populations requirement. *Inland Empire Public Lands Council v. United States Forest Serv.*, 88 F.3d 754 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996). Recently, however, the Ninth Circuit has revisited its holding in *Inland Empire*, and held that if the Forest Service utilizes a “proxy-on-proxy” approach to meeting the agency’s NFMA obligations, any habitat models must be grounded in fact and field verified. *Idaho Sporting Congress v. Rittenhouse*, 305 F.3d 957 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002). The court also acknowledged that other courts have expressly disavowed the holding in *Inland Empire*, casting additional doubt on the validity of that case. *See generally, Sierra Club v. Martin*, 168 F.3d 1 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999), *Utah Environmental Congress v. Zieroth*, 190 F. Supp. 2d 1265, 1272 (D. Utah 2002) (holding that § 219.19 unambiguously requires collection of population data), *Forest Guardians v. U.S. Forest Service*, 180 F. Supp. 2d 1273 (D.N.M. 2001) (same).

On the Mt. Hood National Forest, the Forest Service has failed to survey for any management indicator species, or even to assess their viability based on habitat availability (but only if a certain MIS was difficult to survey for). Given the developing reinterpretation of the legal requirements attendant to management indicator species, it is questionable at best whether the multiple mandates in NFMA and its implementing regulations requiring population monitoring and surveying are being met for the No Whisky timber sale. Given this situation, we recommend that the USFS immediately withdraw the scoping letter until the appropriate information can be gathered for this project.

The No Whisky EA reports that the winter range road densities that overlap the No Whisky project area are on target for compliance with the LRMP. It does not specify whether the reported road density includes closed system roads that are currently open or illegal OHV roads. The lack of such analysis is arbitrary and capricious, violating NFMA and NEPA requirements.

As reported by Edge, D. 1997 (Effects of Thinning on Deer and Elk Populations. Extension Wildlife Specialist in the Dept. of Fisheries and Wildlife, OR), hiding cover decreases substantially after thinning. The loss of cover can be ameliorated by leaving adjacent areas in a dense condition and/or by road closures. Since the adjacent areas of Forest Service land that are

not included in this 1678 acre project have already been recently logged via one of the numerous other recent sales in the area there are no “adjacent” lands that can serve the purpose of ameliorating the loss of hiding cover. Further, since the Forest Service is currently unable to control OHV misuse of the area or maintain closures on closed system roads, the other option of road closures is not available.

#### 5.4 Migratory Birds.

The No Whisky timber sale would significantly impact migratory birds in violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. 16 U.S.C. §§ 703—712 (1994). The No Whisky sale would likely directly kill nesting migratory birds and reduce migratory bird habitat that exist in the planning area. The proposed sale would additionally fragment migratory bird habitat. Unlogged areas would also be negatively impacted by generalist bird species favored by the environmental conditions created in highly fragmented forest. The impact these abundant and highly competitive bird species would have on sensitive bird species dependent on intact and less fragmented forests failed to appear in the EA. The astonishingly vapid comment found in the No Whisky EA, “the effects of commercially thinning 1,678 acres of mid-seral stands would most likely have a combination of positive, neutral, and negative impacts on migratory songbird use....” should be avoided. This statement is overtly inadequate to describe the project’s effects on these species.

The impacts that the sale would have on migratory birds are supported by multiple scientific studies. Forest fragmentation is considered to be a primary cause behind declines observed in many forest songbird species and further loss or fragmentation of habitat could lead to a collapse of regional populations of some forest birds. Robinson *et al.* 1995. As landscapes become increasingly fragmented, regional declines of migrant populations may result. *Id.* In the Pacific Northwest, researchers have found that late-successional forests are integral to the survival of migratory birds. *Avian Population Trends in the Pacific Northwest*. The EA failed to address this information.

In August 1999, the FWS outlined what it perceived to be the agency’s legal obligation in terms of migratory birds and timber harvest. FWS stated that agencies should take “an extremely cautious position with respect to the intentional take of migratory birds by federal agencies.” *Letter from Acting Director, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to Regional Directors, Regions 1–7 and Assistant Director, Refuges and Wildlife (August 17, 1999)*, 3. FWS also cautioned that “the Service should not assert in any communication or correspondence that federal agencies are not covered by the prohibitions of the MBTA [Migratory Bird Treaty Act].” *Id.*

In July 2000, the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals held that federal agencies are required to obtain a take permit from FWS prior to implementing any project that will result in take of migratory birds. *Humane Soc’y of the United States v. Glickman*, 217 F.3d 882 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000). Due to this litigation, the FWS is operating under the assumption that the Migratory Bird Treaty Act applies to the Forest Service and its activities. 16 U.S.C. § 703 et seq. The Act states that

“it shall be unlawful at any time, by any means or in any manner, to pursue, hunt, take, capture, kill, attempt to take, capture, or kill . . . any migratory bird.” 16 U.S.C. § 703.

In January 2001, President Clinton signed Executive Order 13,186 that outlined the federal government’s responsibility to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Exec. Order No. 13,186, 66 Fed. Reg. 3,853 (2001). President Bush has not rescinded this Order. Recent legal analysis confirms that the Forest Service must actively prevent the take of migratory birds, or obtain a permit for incidental take of individual species. Helen M. Kim, *Chopping Down the Birds: Logging and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act*, 31 ENVTL. L. 125 (2001).

The Forest Service has ignored these legal and scientific obligations. The agency failed to demonstrate that it has complied with the requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act in the No Whisky EA.

### 5.5 Survey and Manage Species.

Surveys done for plant species indicates that two lichens identified in the Survey and Manage list were found in the project area. An assertion is made that the trees containing these lichens “would be marked as leave trees.” EA p 76 However, there is no analysis of potential impacts to these species through logging trees that may be adjacent to these sites nor even any indication that these sites have been marked in the field. Ultimately, nowhere in the EA does it suggest that these sites have actually been marked as leave trees, thus providing the decision maker with the knowledge that requirement outlined in the 2001 Survey and Manage Standards and Guidelines have been met. In an interagency memo (2630(FS)/ 1736 PFP (BLM) (OR-935) P ) dated August 12, 2002, Management Recommendations are defined:

The overall goal of the Recommendations is to provide for long-term site persistence at the site scale. How that is achieved is likely to vary across the range (even across a project area) and requires site-specific recommendations and professional judgment from local botanists and biologists. If the recommendations are not followed the rationale used in making that determination must be documented.

One of the lichens found, *Peltigera pacifica*, does not have any known Management Recommendation. It is therefore incumbent upon the Forest Service to provide a rationale for how the determination that not cutting the one tree in which this species inhabits will provide for long-term site persistence at the site scale. The No Whisky Decision Notice fails to provide this rationale and thus violates NEPA and NFMA.

### 6 The No Whisky EA fails to adequately analyze the project’s impact to soil resources.

The proposed project also violates NFMA because it will permanently impair the productivity of the area due to degradation of soil productivity, significant changes to watershed functions, the introduction of exotic invasive weeds, and the increase in the already high rates of erosion and sedimentation. 36 C.F.R. §§ 219.14 (a)(2); 219.27(a)(1). There is no scientific support in the scoping letter, nor in the nearby South Fork EA, that these impacts can be adequately mitigated. Therefore, the project must be withdrawn until compliance with NFMA can be obtained.

The EA only briefly describes the types of impacts that logging can cause to soil resources generally; and it does provide a site-specific analysis of how the No Whisky sale will affect soils within the planning area. The Forest Service is required to conduct a site-specific analysis, and to document how the proposed project will affect the resource at issue. 36 C.F.R. § 219.27(a)(1). The agency failed to adequately document this issue in EA.

## 6.1 Mycorrhizae

The EA failed to recognize the importance of mycorrhizal fungi on forest growth and productivity, and to discuss how mycorrhizae will be impacted by the proposed timber project. This resource's important function in forest ecology must not be overlooked.

The EA failed to address how past logging has affected mycorrhizae in areas within the analysis area that have been logged. Scientific evidence suggests that mycorrhizae and other soil organisms and processes are extremely important and are easily destroyed by ground-based logging. Without a discussion of the impacts to soil mycorrhizae, Bark and the decisionmaker are precluded from making an informed decision regarding the proposed project, and the USFS cannot assert that there will be no permanent impairment of the soil. 30 C.F.R. §§ 219.27(a)(1), 219.14(a)(2) (prohibiting activities unless technology is available to prevent impairment of soil or water resources).

## 6.2 Soil Compaction and Disturbance.

Bark requested the EA include a rigorous analysis of soil compaction and disturbance found in the No Whisky project area. We expected a discussion of site-specific soil compaction and disturbance levels in the proposed units rather than the assertion that no further adverse soil conditions will result post project. With historic logging that has resulted in soil conditions that often exceed the 15% cumulative effects threshold for soil resources, serious examination of this issue is required. With over 65% of the No Whisky project violating the 15% level, a rigorous analysis was expected and not found. In addition to these disclosures, the EA failed to adequately discuss how soil disturbance will affect the area's ability to remain productive.

Bark is not assuaged by assurances by the agency that it can prevent adverse impacts to already damaged soil resources in the planning area, or that mitigation can resolve "some" of these impacts. What is the MHN's record of adhering to BMPs and preventing soil displacement and erosion? Given the fact that the planning area is likely to be already experiencing a high level of adverse soil effects from historical salvage logging, it is improbable that administration of the No Whisky timber sale will be significantly different than past entries.

It is expected that any units not be consistent with LRMP standards will be dropped. Given that the LRMP is a serious document that was written with the expectation of timber sales continuing on the MHN, it is Bark's expectation that the Clackamas River Ranger District will respect the gravity of that document's guidance on soil standards. Forest Service must drop these units from harvest that exceed the LRMP standards; there is no legal authority for "exceptions" from LRMP standards when the majority of the project area violates the standards. 16 U.S.C § 1604(i); 36

C.F.R. § 219.10(e). In addition, mitigation measures designed to minimize detrimental soil conditions are essentially ineffective and inappropriate for forest conditions and soils.

Given the fact that the USFS has a demonstrated inability to conserve soil resources and protect soil from detrimental compaction and disturbance, the agency should be precluded from conducting any ground-based logging in the No Whisky planning area. Similarly, given the fact that the USFS does not adequately address the impacts on soils in the planning area, it is impossible to determine whether the USFS will violate Forest Plan standards, as well as NFMA standards that require the conservation of soil resources. 36 C.F.R. § 219.27(a)(1).

### 6.3 Coarse Woody Debris Retention.

Maritime forests of western North America are notable for the very large amounts of living and dead biomass which they accumulate over long periods. The presence of coarse woody debris (CWD) in large amounts, as well as large standing volume, is a frequently cited indicator of late-successional forest conditions.

The salvage logging history means that there is a significant lack of CWD in the planning area. There seem to be no plans to remedy this situation, other than some attempts to avoid some concentrations of CWD. Bark recommends that the Forest Service consider replicated CWD in areas deficient of this material, such as by bundling small diameter trees together to form larger “logs.” While not as beneficial as large down wood naturally occurring in late-successional stands, these structures can mimic some of the function provide by natural down wood. All efforts should be made to retain CWD where it is found in No Whisky units.

No published evidence exists directly on the long-term effects of one-time thins on rates and levels of total CWD and biomass accumulation in stands as old as those that are present in the No Whisky planning area. Some strong inferences can be made, however, based on thinning trials involving repeated light thins. Compared to one-time thins, repeated light thins leave less unoccupied growing space for less time, increasing the likelihood that the residual canopy trees can reclaim the freed-up growing space. They also deliver less abrupt, hence less traumatic, shocks to the residual forest.

The results of repeated light thin trials thus offer what is likely to be an optimistic picture of the effects of single heavy thins. Most such thinning trials have started with very young stands which have not yet reached crown closure. However, the McLeary Trial in Southwest Washington, which started on a 57-year-old natural, predominantly Douglas-fir stand, provides probably the most relevant published evidence. The thinning regime was of three relatively light thins at five-year intervals: a first thin removing about 13% of the standing volume, and subsequent thins removing roughly two thirds of the newly accrued gross volume growth.

At the end of a fifteen-year interval, the unthinned stand had produced about 14% more total volume (including thinning removals and mortality) than the thinned one. The remaining live wood volume, thanks to the removals, was 64% greater on the unthinned stand. The unthinned stand had also produced about twice as much dead wood (mortality) as the thinned stand. King, “*Review of Douglas Fir thinning trials*” in Oliver et al., Eds., 1986.

It is not just the standing volume which is diminished by these thins, but also the rate at which future biomass accumulates. Residual trees do sometimes experience growth release, but it doesn't begin to make up for all the biomass accumulators, i.e. trees, which have been removed. Data from unpublished stand exams of commercial thin sites on the Olympic National Forest also typically reveal large falloffs in rates of total volume accumulation. Jan Henderson, Address at Olympic National Forest Service Headquarters (2003).

Published results for repeated light thins starting with very young stands prior to canopy closure, reveal a slightly different picture. For example, in their latest report on the LOGS trials, Marshall and Curtis (1992) report that at stand age 60, total standing live volume in unthinned controls is now less than that of the lightest thinning treatments, and the rate of accumulation is less. Gross periodic annual increment (biomass accumulation) continues to be greatest in the unthinned control, however; the difference is due to large amounts of ongoing competitive mortality in the unthinned stand. Thus even under the sorts of early and repeated light thinning regimes most favorable to tree growth response and biomass accumulation, the result holds true that thinning still marginally reduces biomass accumulation rates.

Given the preceding discussion, it is clear that the likely effects of a relatively heavy one-time thin in relatively older forest are not consistent with the stated purpose and need of creating and maintaining late-successional forest. A significant drop in the stock of standing biomass reduces present and future biomass available for snag recruitment, and, through reduced competition, immediately reduces tree mortality. In a commercial context, tree mortality is a waste; in an ecological context, it is a desirable and complexity-augmenting event.

The Forest Service cannot claim that the purpose and need of the No Whisky timber sale is to create late-successional habitat conditions when it simultaneously reduces the present and future pool of biomass from which snags and CWD are derived, and also creates snags by topping the largest trees in the stand. Snags and CWD are stages in an ongoing process of decadence, mortality, and decomposition, not a fixed stock. If the process fails to operate at natural levels because large amounts of biomass have been removed, one-time creation of artificial snags is a poor substitute because it is highly uncertain whether wildlife uses created snags, or whether they function as surrogates for naturally-occurring snags and CWD.

#### 6.4 Snags.

Much like CWD, the planning area is deficient in snag habitat. The EA is unclear regarding its treatment of snag habitat since its reference contains a caveat too large to actually have value, and whether forest plan standards would be met post-project. While the MHFP typically pursues a 60% biological potential for snag habitat, due to the previous history of salvage logging this standard will not be met post-project. Even the landscape standard of 40% of the biological potential is highly unlikely to be met post-project. Further logging, specifically to avoid stand mortality, diametrically acts against snag recruitment occurring at appropriate levels.

The units are plantations and contain very few large snags because they were cut down when the area was clearcut. There are some medium size second-growth

snags and some short crumbled remnants of old large snags. These types of snags are not generally hazardous but if they are hazardous to the logging operation they would have to be felled. All non-hazardous snags would be retained, and some live trees would be marked to leave where their crowns touch certain key snags to increase the likelihood that they would be retained. Also all existing down logs would be retained. EA p 49

Bark requests clarification of: 1) what the LRMP requirement for snag habitat within the No Whisky project area is; 2) what the biological potential will be post-project; 3) whether this will be consistent with LRMP standards; 4) and whether at the landscape level (including private and BLM lands) this will be consistent with LRMP standards.

## 7 Noxious Weeds.

In a recent letter received by the Appellant, Gary Larsen, Supervisor, Mt. Hood National Forest, states, “Invasive plants are compromising our ability to manage the National Forests for a healthy native ecosystem” (Update letter received September 14, 2005).

According to the USDA’s Pacific Northwest Region Invasive Plant Program Final Environmental Impact Statement (Invasive EIS),

Roads and roadside habitats are particularly susceptible to plant invasions for a number of reasons. Roads eliminate some of the physical and environmental barriers that prevent plant invasions by increasing light availability and opportunities for dispersal. Micro-environmental changes along roads can provide opportunities for invasion because many invasive plants are favored by open, disturbed habitats. Disturbance closely associated with roads and the establishment and spread of invasive plants are vehicular traffic and maintenance activities, road, grading, roadside mowing, and keeping roads free of fallen or overhanging vegetation. These activities can increase invasive plant introductions because open spaces with higher light availability, invasive plants can follow roads by natural dispersal mechanisms or be transported along them by animals or humans. **For this reason, roads are primary vectors for the spread of invasive species** (pp 3-18, emphasis added).

The costs associated with the treatment of invasive plants range from \$40-\$340 and annually costs USDA Forest Service Region 6 \$4.8 million (Invasive EIS, 4-94). Furthermore, the treatment of invasive plants requires measures that themselves have significant impacts on the human and natural environment. The Proposed Action referred to in the Update Letter from Gary Larsen includes the treatment of 13,000 acres in the Mt. Hood National Forest, all but 125 of which will be done with the use of herbicides. “The proposed use of herbicides could result in cumulative doses of herbicides to workers, the general public, non-target plant species, and/or wildlife” (Invasive EIS, 4-2).

The EA failed to adequately discuss the status of noxious weeds in the planning area. Disturbed soils – such as those created through logging, road construction, and illegal OHV use – provide

ideal habitat for noxious weed introduction and spread. However, there is only minimal explanation in the EA of how the Forest Service proposes to deal with this issue. Bark notes that the standard listing of mitigation measures (i.e., washing logging equipment), have proven ineffective in the past and expected a more rigorous approach to this issue.

The courts have recently held that failing to address an action alternative that would *prevent* the introduction of noxious weeds is arbitrary and capricious, and violates NEPA for failing to consider a reasonable range of alternatives. *Blue Mts. Biodiversity Project v. United States Forest Serv.*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1140, 1147 (D. Or. 2002). That case also held that the USFS erred in tiering its analysis of noxious weed spread and introduction to the 1988 FEIS and Record of Decision on Managing Competing and Unwanted vegetation, and that the Forest Service violated NEPA in failing to prepare a supplemental EIS for the 1988 FEIS and ROD. *Id.* at 1148 – 1149.

Given this legal interpretation of the Forest Service’s obligations vis-à-vis noxious weed introduction and spread, the USFS must withdraw the No Whisky Scoping. Failing to do so is arbitrary, capricious, and not in accordance with law. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

#### 8 The EA Failed to State whether all Practicable Means to Avoid or Minimize Environmental Harm Have Been Adopted.

NEPA’s regulations explicitly require that agencies state in a NEPA decision whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm have been adopted and, if not, why. 40 C.F.R. § 1505.2(2).

NFMA requires that “management prescriptions that involve vegetative manipulation of tree cover for any purpose shall: Be best suited to the multiple-use goals established for the areas with potential environmental, biological, cultural resource, aesthetic, engineering, and economic impacts, as stated in the regional guides and forest plans being considered in this determination.” 36 C.F.R. § 219.27(b)(1). The No Whisky timber sale violates NFMA since the extensive logging and associated impacts continue to cause soil erosion, soil compaction, loss of mycorrhizae, increased peak flows, and adverse impacts to water quality. Consequently, while logging techniques that cause the least amount of soil disturbance should be used, the character of the terrain is expected to lead the Clackamas River Ranger District to fail this test.

#### 9 Scientific Controversy Surrounding Thinning to Increase Stand Diversity and Create Late-Successional Characteristics Compels the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.

Over the past few years, a debate has begun to form around the efficacy of thinning overstocked forest stands. Some researchers argue that this practice is beneficial; while others claim that the practice of “restoration silviculture” is too new to hold up as a panacea for past mismanagement of forestlands. *Thinning Science Summary*; *Density Management/Riparian Silviculture: Literature Review; Science Update* – [Restoring Complexity: Second-Growth Forests and Habitat Diversity](#). Nevertheless, the Forest Service maintains that there is only “one way” to “create” old growth, and laments natural processes that may take more time. This overlooks the fact that old growth *should* take significant time to develop. *FEMAT*, IX-20.

As mentioned previously, NEPA has two primary goals: (1) to insure that the agency has fully contemplated the environmental effects of its action; and (2) to insure the public has sufficient information to challenge the agency. The EA failed to disclose and discuss the directly applicable and conflicting science on restoration silviculture and not foreclose meaningful public participation and involvement in the project. A concerned member of the public reviewing the No Whisky project should understand that there is considerable scientific debate regarding broad scale application of thinning to “create” old growth habitat.

NEPA requires that the Forest Service support its conclusions with scientific information and analysis. The Ninth Circuit in *Idaho Sporting Congress v. Thomas* stated that “we conclude that NEPA requires that the public receive the underlying environmental data from which a Forest Service expert derived her opinion.” 137 F.3d 1146, 1150 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998). Similarly, NEPA does not allow an agency to simply disregard contrary science that is directly applicable to its proposal. *Silva v. Lynn*, 482 F.2d 1282, 1285 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1973) (“[NEPA] helps insure the integrity of the process of decision by precluding stubborn problems or serious criticism from being swept under the rug”); *Seattle Audubon Society v. Lyons*, 871 F.Supp. 1291, 1318 (W.D. Wash. 1994), *aff’d sub nom. Seattle Audubon Society v. Moseley*, 80 F.3d 1401 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996) (NEPA requires the agency to “disclose responsible scientific opinion in opposition to the proposed action, and make a good faith, reasoned response to it”); *Seattle Audubon Society v. Moseley*, 798 F.Supp. 1473, 1479 (W.D. Wash. 1992), *aff’d sub nom. Seattle Audubon Society v. Espy*, 998 F.2d 699 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993) (The failure to disclose and respond to the opinions held by well respected scientists concerning the hazards of a proposed action “is fatally deficient”).

In this case, there is significant scientific debate about the efficacy of thinning to create stand diversity, especially as this practice might apply to the No Whisky planning area. The courts have held that a discussion of the scientific controversy must either be found within the individual NEPA document, such as the No Whisky EA, or at least summarized and incorporated by reference, as required by NEPA. *Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project v. Blackwood*, 161 F.3d at 1214 (“The EA contains virtually no references to any material in support of or in opposition to its conclusions. *That is where the Forest Service’s defense of its position must be found*”) (emphasis added); *League of Wilderness Defenders v. Forsgren*, 184 F.Supp.2d at 1069; *League of Wilderness Defenders v. Zelinski*, 187 F.Supp.2d at 1271; *Sierra Club v. Bosworth*, 199 F.Supp.2d at \*10-\*11. *See also* 40 C.F.R. §§ 1508.27(b)(4); 1508.27(b)(5); 1502.24.

The Clackamas River Ranger District failed to either disclose the controversy in the EA or summarize and incorporate by reference the relevant studies. Failure to do so would mean that any NEPA documents would be fatally flawed. In the alternative, the USFS may prepare an EIS that carefully addresses all scientific evidence surrounding restoration silviculture and whether this treatment is appropriate for the No Whisky planning area.

## 9.1 Understory Regeneration.

Excessive monospecific understory regeneration is an increasingly acknowledged problem of forest thinning in many plant associations. Such outcomes typically diminish the habitat value and fine-scale diversity of thinned forests. In the southern part of the region, this often takes the

form of dense clonal salal shrub layers. Tappeiner et al, 1991. In the hemlock-dominated portions of the pacific slope forests (from northern Washington on through the Alaska panhandle) the commonest problem is hemlock seedling regeneration at densities of many thousands per acre. This problem is well described in published literature for sites in SE Alaska. Alabeck and Tappeiner 1991; Hanley and McKendrick, 1985.

In western Washington, area ecologist Jan Henderson has observed and reported this phenomenon on many thinning sites in the Olympic and Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forests. Under heavier thinnings, a common outcome is a dense second canopy layer of hemlock, which virtually eliminates shrub or forb layers in the forest. Under lighter thinnings, the canopy may re-close tightly and early enough, so that the developing hemlock understory, once established, fails to grow into a second canopy. Rather it persists for long periods as a low, dense shrub-like layer.

Adolescent stands with a high hemlock component in the initial cohort typically lack significant understory forb or shrub development. Such stands are at greatest risk for this phenomenon. Following thinning, a dense hemlock seed rain encounters no established competitors, and light and moisture levels and organic litter well suited to hemlock seedling establishment. On mesic, productive sword-fern association sites, excessive hemlock regeneration can occur even in the presence of substantial preexisting forb and shrub understories.

Such adverse regeneration outcomes matter little under a commercial thinning regime, since biodiversity is not an objective, and since later entry (i.e. felling of all or most residual members of the thinned cohort) typically occurs within twenty years, at which point the forest development clock is effectively re-set to zero. Under extended rotations, however, such as the 120-150 year rotations advocated by so-called “biodiversity pathway” thinning or one-time thinning entries for LSR or Riparian Reserve lands, these outcomes matter; they effectively defeat the biodiversity rationale for this thinning in the first place. Carey et al., 1996.

## 9.2 Thinning Regularity.

Natural disturbance regimes are disorderly and occur on a continuum of scales. Partly in consequence of their long exposure to these disturbance regimes, old forests, and old trees, have a characteristic, but hard-to-describe, irregularity. This irregularity has a fractal, scale-independent feel: at any scale one cares to examine, complex mixtures of order and disorder, with irregular boundaries, can be discerned. Conventional thinning, in contrast to natural disturbances, is regular and simplifying in its effects, and can “result in reduced patterns of spatial heterogeneity in plant species composition, function, and structure – the reverse of most natural stand development processes.” Lindenmayer and Franklin, 1983.

Thinning patterns characterized by skips (completely unthinned patches), gaps (small openings such as might be created naturally by laminated root rot or windthrow), and multiple thinning densities, all applied irregularly, not according to some regular pattern, are a partial answer to this failing. The biodiversity pathway management proposal takes a very small step in the right direction by calling for alternation of two different densities in one-acre patches. Carey et al,

1996. While less homogenizing than uniform density thins, this remains a highly regular and unnatural landscape pattern.

While the thin planned for most units at No Whisky take this small step, they differ little from traditional homogenizing silvicultural thins designed to promote uniformly large, merchantable trees. “Thinning from below” can be expected to narrow the range of tree sizes in these stands and will act directly against increasing structural diversity.

We cannot see how these traditional silvicultural thinning result serves to accelerate late-successional habitat conditions through silvicultural harvest. Late successional habitat is about more than just regularly spaced large trees, but the Forest Service has failed to take this into consideration.

#### 10 The No Whisky timber sale is Inconsistent with Applicable Laws and is Arbitrary and Capricious in Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act.

The Administrative Procedure Act requires reviewing courts to “hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be...arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). The court will look to see if the USFS decision was “based on a consideration of the relevant factors... Moreover, it must engage in a ‘substantial inquiry’ into the facts, one that is ‘searching and careful.’” *Northern Spotted Owl v. Hodel*, 716 F.Supp 479, 482 (W.D. Wash. 1988), quoting *Ethyl Corp. v. EEA*, 541 F.2d 1, at 34 (D.C. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 426 U.S. 941 (1976). Bark has serious concerns that the No Whisky timber sale has not be based on a consideration of relevant factors. In that case, the decision to not consider a full range of alternatives via an EIS will be arbitrary and capricious.

The failure to eruditely consider all relevant environmental impacts in the EA was arbitrary and capricious. Such a decision contravenes the clear intent of NEPA as well as NEPA’s implementing regulations that require the USFS to fully consider the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of this project in conjunction with other past and future impacts in the area. 40 C.F.R. §§1500.1(b), 1508.25(2), 1508.27(b)(7); *Sierra Club v. United States Forest Service*, 843 F.2d 1190, 1193 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988).

### CONCLUSION

The No Whisky timber sale analysis area provides important aquatic and terrestrial habitat for a multitude of species. However, the proposed project and adjacent past and present projects would log a significant remaining stretch of forest that facilitates wildlife movement in a landscape that has been highly fragmented by the pursuit of timber at the cost of multiple use values such as wildlife, clean water, and recreation.

Information about non-game sensitive and listed wildlife species was inadequate, speculative, and/or evasive. Habitat conditions strongly indicate that the MHNH is not providing for viable

populations of spotted owl, various anadromous fish, and numerous other species affected by high road densities and the loss of interior forest habitat in almost all sub-basins. Water quality information was found to be lacking. Illegal OHV use and illegal dumpsites are a particularly persistent problem for the area. Exotic weeds are spreading throughout the forest and decreasing wildlife habitat values.

In light of these existing conditions, the proposed project will have significant cumulative impacts when viewed in conjunction with other past, present and future timber projects. The poor condition of areas of the forest is aggravated by non-federal activities on adjacent lands. It is Bark's hope that these issue will be addressed through the requested stay of action and requested relief.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Alex". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Alex P. Brown

## Partial List of Literature Cited

Espinosa, F.A., Rhodes, J.J., and McCullough, D.A.. 1997. The failure of existing plans to protect salmon habitat on the Clearwater National Forest in Idaho. *Journal of Environmental Management*. 49: 205-230.

General Accounting Office, *Financial Management: Annual Costs of Forest Service's Timber Sales Program Are Not Determinable* (2001), GAO-01-110R Forest Service Timber Costs.

Hennon, P.E. *Northwest Science*, Vol. 69, No. 4, 1995

Mathews, Daniel, Cascade-Olympic Natural History, Raven Editions, Portland, OR: 1999  
pp268,269

Ziemer, R.R., and Lisle, T.E., 1993. Evaluating sediment production by activities related to forest uses--A Northwest Perspective. *Proceedings: Technical Workshop on Sediments*, Feb., 1992, Corvallis, Oregon. pp. 71-74.