Friends of the Clearwater
Keeping Idaho's Clearwater Basin Wild
P.O. Box 9241 Moscow, ID 83843 | (208) 882-9755 | friendsoftheclearwater.org

May 25, 2023

Amy Thompson, Project Leader,
Lacy Lemoosh Project
St. Joe Ranger District
222 South 7th Street Ste. 1
St. Maries, ID 83861

Comments submitted via project website at:
https://cara.fs2c.usda.gov/Public//CommentInput?Project=60853 and emailed to:
amy.thompson@usda.gov

These are comments on the Lacy Lemoosh Proposed Action for Scoping (April 2023), on behalf of Friends of the Clearwater, Alliance for the Wild Rockies, and WildEarth Guardians.

We believe that most activities included in the Proposed Action (PA) to meet alleged project objectives to "improve forest health and resiliency to disturbances such as wildfire, drought, insects or diseases, reduce hazardous fuels within the wildland urban interface (WUI) and other areas to lessen the severity of wildfires and to enable safe fire suppression efforts, provide economic benefit to local communities through sustainable use of natural resources and benefits for local communities" are misguided. We also believe there ways to "reduce sediment delivery to streams from forest routes to maintain or improve Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) related water quality concerns and recover degraded aquatic habitat for native species" without carrying on the climate degrading and forest ecologically damaging clearcutting and other logging activities. That would entail focusing restoration actions on removing much of the excessive road network from the landscape.

The project area abuts the privately owned Palouse Divide Lodge. Massive clearcutting would reduce the scenic value of the area and create a serious concern to long-term financial sustainability of the business.

Speaking of clearcuts, the NPCNF is one of the Northern Region's Clearcut Kings. More huge clearcuts would be particularly egregious in light of the routine authorizations issued by Regional Forester Marten, as documented by Friends of the Clearwater (*see* Bilodeau and Juel, 2021).

The region surrounding the project area has seen heavily logged at least since the 1980s, primarily on private land parcels. This can be observed with the 1984-2020 timelapse we've created, viewable and downloadable at: https://drive.proton.me/urls/0T19955PW8#wh0bTB9q7hi4. This national forest parcel would be better off as a biodiversity sanctuary and as part of a nationwide network of climate reserves.

Private land continues to provide the vast majority of timber products in Idaho so logging here isn't economically significant.

This project would be a major theat to elk security. In the region, high road density and large-scale clearcuts has reduced cover that elk use during hunting season as well as thermal regulation in winter. Drastically increasing road density will create significantly adverse impacts on wildlife including elk.

A wildlife biologist present on the walk-around, which FOC staff attended, acknowledged there was little reliable data on elk numbers in the area due to the difficulty of observing elk in the forests of the area. Any claim that elk habitat must be propped up through clearcutting is not based on accurate information.

Viewing the forest through a tree farming lens, as does the PA, will lead to the wrong solutions for imaginary problems such as the alleged "deviat(ion) from desired conditions as described in the Forest Plan." The Forest Service would better serve the forest, the citizens of this country and the planet, the wildlife, water, and natural diversity by evolving into an agency dedicated to sustainably managing the forest as part of a nationwide network of climate reserves. This means forgoing resource extraction and valuing the forest ecosystems for their critical contributions for mitigating the ongoing climate crisis.

The Forest Service is deceivingly and deliberately exacerbating climate change, already on an extremely dangerous trajectory. It must be seriously demoralizing for rational, thinking people to be asked to defend bogus metrics of "forest health" and acting in complete denial of the climate crisis. Being a part of the problem of the biggest crisis facing humanity by far and not raising a finger to be a part of the solution is absurd and tragic. The word "climate" does not even appear in the PA.

Although we have been pushing the FS to recognize the scale of the climate crisis and find appropriate responses, the agency just more deeply augurs its head into the sand. The FS is willfully participating in the destruction of the Earth's atmosphere. All the scientific conclusions we cite are common knowledge by now, so it takes callous, active denial to ignore it.

In the recent revised Forest Plan Draft EIS for the Custer-Gallatin National Forest, the FS's words are, "Climate change is expected to continue and have profound effects on the Earth's ecosystems in the coming decades (IPCC 2007)." As alarming as the words in the FS's cited IPCC 2007 are, more recent reports from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) makes that 2007 report seem optimistic. See e.g., IPCC Special Report, 2014 for starters.

In a March 20, 2023 Press Release introducing the SYNTHESIS REPORT OF THE IPCC SIXTH ASSESSMENT REPORT (AR6), the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) states, "This Synthesis Report underscores the urgency of taking more ambitious action and shows that, if we act now, we can still secure a liveable sustainable future for all." It goes on:

> In 2018, IPCC highlighted the unprecedented scale of the challenge required to keep warming to 1.5°C. Five years later, that challenge has become even greater due to a

> continued increase in greenhouse gas emissions. The pace and scale of what has been done so far, and current plans, are insufficient to tackle climate change.
>
> More than a century of burning fossil fuels as well as unequal and unsustainable energy and land use has led to global warming of 1.1°C above pre-industrial levels. This has resulted in more frequent and more intense extreme weather events that have caused increasingly dangerous impacts on nature and people in every region of the world.
>
> Every increment of warming results in rapidly escalating hazards. More intense heatwaves, heavier rainfall and other weather extremes further increase risks for human health and ecosystems. In every region, people are dying from extreme heat. Climate-driven food and water insecurity is expected to increase with increased warming. When the risks combine with other adverse events, such as pandemics or conflicts, they become even more difficult to manage.

A *Missoulian* article on the release of that report quotes United Nations Secretary-General Antonio Guterres: "Humanity is on thin ice — and that ice is melting fast. …Our world needs climate action on all fronts —everything, everywhere, all at once." That article quotes from the report, "The choices and actions implemented in this decade will have impacts for thousands of years" calling climate change "a threat to human well-being and planetary health." It quotes report co-author and water scientist Aditi Mukherji: "We are not on the right track but it's not too late. Our intention is really a message of hope, and not that of doomsday."

From a 2022 report, "The rise in weather and climate extremes has led to some irreversible impacts as natural and human systems are pushed beyond their ability to adapt." (IPCC Climate Change 2022, Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability, Summary for Policymakers - Working Group II Contribution.) Also see news accounts "AP-Report warns of looming climate catastrophe", "BBC-IPCC report warns of 'irreversible' impacts of global warming" and "AP-UN 'house on fire' report".

There is extremely urgent scientific concern expressed over the imminent effects of climate change on the earth's ecosystems, and therefore on civilization itself. The IPCC's 2018 report states that if greenhouse gas emissions continue at the current rate, the atmosphere will warm up by as much as 2.7 degrees Fahrenheit (1.5 degrees Celsius) above preindustrial levels by 2040, inundating coastlines and intensifying droughts and poverty. The report paints a much darker picture of the immediate consequences of climate change than previously described, and says that avoiding the damage requires transforming the world economy at a speed and scale that has "no documented historic precedent."

The 2018 IPCC report describes a world of worsening food shortages and wildfires, and a mass die-off of coral reefs as soon as 2040—a period well within the lifetime of much of the global population. The report "is quite a shock, and quite concerning," said Bill Hare, an author of previous IPCC reports and a physicist with Climate Analytics, a nonprofit organization. "We were not aware of this just a few years ago." The report was the first to be commissioned by world leaders under the Paris agreement, the 2015 pact by nations to fight climate change.

The authors of the 2018 IPCC report project that if greenhouse gas emissions continue at the current rate, the atmosphere will warm by as much as 2.7 degrees Fahrenheit (1.5 degrees Celsius) above preindustrial levels by 2040, inundating coastlines and intensifying droughts and poverty. Previous work had focused on estimating the damage if average temperatures were to rise by a larger number, 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius), because that was the threshold scientists previously considered for the most severe effects of climate change. The 2018 IPCC report, however, shows that many of those effects will come much sooner, at the 2.7-degree mark.

Executive Order 13990 of January 20, 2021 (Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science To Tackle the Climate Crisis) sets the policy of the Biden Administration to "…reduce greenhouse gas emissions; to bolster resilience to the impacts of climate change…". Executive Order (EO) 13990 Section 5 (Accounting for the Benefits of Reducing Climate Pollution) at (a) states, "It is essential that agencies capture the full costs of greenhouse gas emissions as accurately as possible, including by taking global damages into account. Doing so facilitates sound decision-making, recognizes the breadth of climate impacts, and supports the international leadership of the United States on climate issues."

Executive Order 14008 of January 27, 2021 (Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad) begins, "The United States and the world face a profound climate crisis. We have a narrow moment to pursue action at home and abroad in order to avoid the most catastrophic impacts of that crisis and to seize the opportunity that tackling climate change presents." Further, President Biden's Executive Order on the Establishment of the Climate Change Support Office (May 7, 2021) calls it a "**global** climate crisis" (emphasis added).

President Biden's April 22, 2022 Executive Order 14072 calls on the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior, within one year, to "define, identify, and complete an **inventory of old-growth and mature forests on Federal lands**, accounting for regional and ecological variations, as appropriate, and making the inventory publicly available." (Emphasis added.) EO 14072 recognizes, "Forests provide clean air and water, sustain the plant and animal life fundamental to combating **the global climate and biodiversity crises**, and hold special importance to Tribal Nations." (Emphasis added.) The Fact Sheet accompanying that E.O. recognizes:

> America's forests are a key climate solution, absorbing carbon dioxide equivalent to more than10% of U.S. annual greenhouse gas emissions. Federal lands are home to many of the nation's mature and old-growth forests, which serve as critical carbon sinks, cherished landscapes, and unique habitats.

The Executive Order will "Safeguard mature and old-growth forests on federal lands, as part of a science-based approach to reduce wildfire risk" and "**Enlist nature to address the climate crisis with comprehensive efforts to deploy nature-based solutions** that reduce emissions and build resilience." (Id., emphasis added.)

We incorporate our August 5, 2022 letter to the Forest Service and BLM in response to the July 15, 2022 Biden Administration Request For Information seeking input on the development of a

definition for old-growth and mature forests on Federal lands and requesting public input on a series of questions.

On April 18, 2023 Deputy Chief, Christopher B. French issued a memo to Regional Foresters entitled "Mature Old Growth Guidance: Infrastructure and Investment Jobs Act and Executive Order 14072". It states:

> In response to E.O. 14072, we recently completed the mature and old-growth (MOG) inventory that is built on the existing old-growth definitions developed by each region over the past 30 years. The inventory methods categorize MOG using approximately 200 combinations of forest type, productivity level and biophysical setting. **We will shortly issue guidance on using this information**. Specific Forest Plan content should guide operations to maintain or contribute toward the restoration of the structure and composition of classified old-growth stands.

(Emphasis added.) Part of any reasonable interpretation of "inventory" as applied to forests would be—is any particular place in a forest **inside** the mature and old-growth inventory, or is it **not**? At this point, the Biden Administration has not produced an inventory that could answer such a question, despite the suggestions it has. No spatially specific or ecological definition of old growth was adopted, which would have incorporated old growth and mature forests' relationships to wildlife, water, and many other natural values.

In "Mature and Old-Growth Forests: Definition, Identification, and Initial Inventory on Lands Managed by the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Fulfillment of Executive Order 14072, Section 2(b)" released along with the French memo, we read:

> This **initial inventory report** is national in scale and presents estimates of old-growth and mature forests across all lands managed by the Forest Service and BLM. In preparing this report, published scientific literature was reviewed and scientists were consulted to understand the current work in this area and to get technical assistance in providing what was needed to respond to Executive Order 14072. **Some cited references (e.g., "in preparation" notations) have not yet undergone scientific peer review and are therefore subject to change.**

(Emphases added.) Nothing in the reports just released nor in EO 14072 itself recognize the threat of logging to old growth and mature forests.

At this point, any lofty goals for EO 14072 as claimed by the president remain remote. Of huge concern to the global community, this includes prioritizing the role of forests as natural climate solutions, instead of targeting them to serve the prevailing capitalist consumptive values that chronically threaten the entire biosphere and our collective future.

DellaSala, et al. (2023) argue:

> …for stepped-up MOG protections by building on the exemplary Tongass National Forest in Alaska where roadless area protections containing MOG, previously removed under the

> Trump administration, were recently reinstated by the Biden administration while also supporting an economic transition out of old-growth logging and into previously logged but reforested sites. Nationwide MOG protections would establish U.S. leadership on the Paris Climate Agreement (natural sinks and reservoirs) and the Glasgow Forest Pledge to end deforestation and forest degradation. It would demonstrate progress toward 30 x 30 and present a global model for effective forest and climate response.

The Draft EIS for the Nez Perce-Clearwater NF's revised forest plan admits, "The current 1987 Forest Plans do not address climate change." That same Draft EIS includes these definitions:

> Carbon Pool: an area that contains an accumulation of carbon or carbon-bearing compounds or having the potential to accumulate such substances. May include live and dead material, soil material, and harvested wood products.
>
> Carbon Stock: the amount or quantity contained in the inventory of a carbon pool.

Neither of the terms "Carbon stock" or "carbon pool" appear in PA.

The project's purpose and need is skewed heavily toward departures from historic conditions, which are the basis of "desired conditions" for vegetation. Yet, in relying on such historic conditions to inform project activities, the FS fails to account for the fact that climate change is fundamentally altering the agency's assumptions about the efficacy of the proposed actions. In other words, the FS cannot rely solely on historic reference conditions to formulate its vegetation treatments. Rather, the agency must also include current reference conditions from areas that have a passive management emphasis, in addition to future reference conditions based on the best available climate models.

Recent science supports the need to look beyond historical references to inform proposed actions: "in a time of pervasive and intensifying change, the implicit assumption that the future will reflect the past is a questionable basis for land management (Falk 2017)." Coop et al., 2020. While it is useful to understand how vegetative conditions have departed from those in the past, (and the role mixed-severity fire played in Ponderosa pine dominated stands), the FS cannot rely on them to define management actions, or reasonably expect the action alternatives will result in restoring ecological processes. Given changing climate conditions, the FS should emphasize reference conditions based on current and future ranges of variability, and less on historic departures. Further, the agency needs to shift its management approach to incorporate the likelihood that no matter what vegetation treatments it implements, there are going to be future forest wildfire-triggered conversions to other vegetation types. As such, the FS cannot rely on the success of resistance strategies, as Coop et al., 2020 explains:

> Contemporary forest management policies, mandates, and science generally fall within the paradigm of resisting conversion, through on-the-ground tactics such as fuel reduction or tree planting. Given anticipated disturbance trajectories and climate change, science syntheses and critical evaluations of such resistance approaches are needed because of their increasing relevance in mitigating future wildfire severity (Stephens et al. 2013, Prichard et al. 2017) and managing for carbon storage (Hurteau et al. 2019b). Managers seeking to

> wisely invest resources and strategically resist change need to understand the efficacy and durability of these resistance strategies in a changing climate. Managers also require new scientific knowledge to inform alternative approaches including accepting or directing conversion, developing a portfolio of new approaches and conducting experimental adaptation, and to even allow and learn from adaptation failures.

Moreseo, the Forest Plan defines areas as suitable for timber production where there is reasonable assurance that such lands can be adequately restocked. Given the changing ecological conditions due to the climate crisis, the likely decreased effectiveness of resistance strategies described by Coop et al, 2020 and the increased risk of vegetative conversion, (especially within areas of regeneration harvest), the FS must provide reasonable assurances that lands proposed for timber production can in fact be adequately restocked, which includes the anticipated time frame. Further, assurances that harvested areas will be replanted are not sufficient to demonstrate trees will be viable as climate crisis impacts increase.

Further, equally important to acknowledging the limitations of resistance strategies is the fact that other pertinent scientific findings show warming and drying trends are having a major impact on forests, resulting in tree die-off even without wildfire or insect infestation. See, e.g., Parmesan, 2006; Breshears et al. 2005; Allen et al. 2010, 2015; Anderegg et al. 2012; Williams et al. 2013; Overpeck 2013; Funk et al. 2014; Millar and Stephenson 2015; Gauthier et al. 2015; Ault et al. 2016 ("business-as-usual emissions of greenhouse gases will drive regional warming and drying, regardless of large precipitation uncertainties"); Vose et al. 2016 ("In essence, a survivable drought of the past can become an intolerable drought under a warming climate").

Given the fallacies of using historic conditions as a reference for desired conditions and the uncertainty that treatments will maintain or restore ecological integrity in the context of climate change and likely forest conversion scenarios, the FS must reevaluate its assumptions about its proposed vegetative treatments, especially in regards to restocking success and species composition. Significant controversy exists as to the need for such treatments given the improper use and reliance on historic conditions. In fact, there is a high likelihood based on the aforementioned studies that some areas will not regenerate and will instead result in conversion to different vegetative groups. The FS should consider whether attrition due to climate change will reduce tree densities sufficiently so that thinning treatments are not needed to meet the project's purpose. NEPA mandates that the agency address this controversy and science that contradicts agency assumptions in an EIS.

In addition to the questionable success of the FS's pursuit of resistance strategies underlying its proposed actions, the agency must also reconsider numerous other assumptions. In fact, many of the agency's assumptions run contrary to the most recent science regarding the impact of logging on wildfire behavior, resilience of the forest to large-scale disturbances, and ability to provide quality wildlife habitat. Many of the scientific studies cited within our comments call into question the FS assumption that its proposed actions will achieve the stated purpose and need. Ultimately, the agency cannot assert that there is broad consensus in the scientific literature that commercial timber harvest or thinning in combination with prescribed fire reduces the potential for high severity wildfire to the extent characterized in the PA. For example, we have seen the FS rely heavily on Prichard et al. 2021 to support its proposed actions and assert broad scientific

consensus as to their efficacy. Yet, even here the researchers raise several factors that the FS must address in an EIS. For example, they explain:

> Fuel reduction treatments are not appropriate for all conditions or forest types (DellaSala et al. 2004, Reinhardt et al. 2008, Naficy et al. 2016). In some mesic forests, for instance, mechanical treatments may increase the risk of fire by increasing sunlight exposure to the forest floor, drying surface fuels, promoting understory growth, and increasing wind speeds that leave residual trees vulnerable to wind throw (Zald and Dunn 2018, Hanan et al. 2020). Such conclusions indicate that treatments within areas of mesic site conditions may not be appropriate.

In addition, Prichard et al, 2021 explains the following:

> In other forest types such as subalpine, subboreal, and boreal forests, low crown base heights, thin bark, and heavy duff and litter loads make trees vulnerable to fire at any intensity (Agee 1996, Stevens et al 2020). Fire regimes in these forests, along with lodgepole pine, are dominated by moderate- and high-severity fires, and applications of forest thinning and prescribed underburning are generally inappropriate.

Ultimately, what the agency proposes is a long-term active management regime that will require repeated tree cutting and burning since nowhere does the FS state it has any plans to allow unmanaged wildfire to play its natural ecological role. This equates to perpetual management with logging and prescribed burning, which is hardly ecological restoration. The FS's misguided efforts to mimic natural disturbance patterns fail to allow natural processes to function, causing unknown long-term results.

Ecological resilience, which the FS implies it would be creating through this project, is not the absence of natural disturbances like wildfire or beetle kill, rather it is the opposite (DellaSala and Hanson, 2015, Chapter 1, pp. 12-13). What the FS promotes is the human control of the forest ecosystem through mechanical and other heavy-handed means to maintain unnatural stasis by eliminating, suppressing or altering natural disturbances such as wildfire, to facilitate the extraction of commercial resources for human use. This is the antithesis of ecological resilience and conservation of native biodiversity. Ecological resilience is the ability to ultimately return to predisturbance vegetation types after a natural disturbance, including higher-severity fire. This sort of dynamic equilibrium, where a varied spectrum of succession stages is present across the larger landscape, tends to maintain the full complement of native biodiversity on the landscape. (Thompson et al., 2009).

The FS must consider and disclose the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed project on climate change, as well as the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of climate change on the proposed action. Climatic conditions, particularly extreme rainfall, snowmelt, and flooding, pose substantial risks to the infrastructure on and near the National Forests. See Six et al., 2018 (studying increased mortality of trees, driven directly or indirectly by climate change), and Schoennagel et al., 2017. These events result in damage or destruction of infrastructure and impacts to environmental resources. Rapid climate change is very likely to increase the size and frequency of these climatic stressors, increasing the hazards and risk to infrastructure, people,

and ecosystems.

The FS must also consider and disclose in an EIS how changes in weather patterns due to climate change, including drought and extreme winds, play a major role in wildfire behavior and wildfire risk. Ignoring these factors will ignore key relevant factors that affect the agency's claimed purpose and need.

Final Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in National Environmental Policy Act Reviews.

The FS must disclose and acknowledge the legal and regulatory framework that should guide its analysis of climate impacts, including the recently reinstated CEQ GHG guidance titled, "NEPA Guidance on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions" (Feb. 19, 2021). In light of the guidance's reinstatement, the FS must apply CEQ's 2016 NEPA climate guidance (or provide a non-arbitrary basis for declining to do so). The guidance contains specific directions concerning how agencies should analyze climate impacts from site-specific forest management projects (using the example of "a prescribed burn") that the agency must consider.

The project will have direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on climate change because the vegetation treatments will impact the ecosystem's ability to store carbon. Many of the area's forests are likely currently acting as carbon sinks, meaning they are storing more carbon than they are emitting. Science makes clear that the proposed action will likely worsen climate emissions by removing trees that are currently fixing carbon, turning them into wood products (which results in a significant loss of that carbon fixed in wood), and leaving a landscape with fewer or no trees and (eventually) seedlings that fix far less carbon than mature forests for decades if not centuries.

The Council on Environmental Quality Guidance, 2016 acknowledges, "changes in our climate caused by elevated concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere are reasonably anticipated to endanger the public health and public welfare of current and future generations." It directs federal agencies to consider the extent to which a proposed action such as the Lacy Lemoosh timber sale would contribute to climate change. It rejects as inappropriate any notion that this timber sale is of too small a scale for such consideration:

> Climate change results from the incremental addition of GHG emissions from millions of individual sources, which collectively have a large impact on a global scale. CEQ recognizes that the totality of climate change impacts is not attributable to any single action, but are exacerbated by a series of actions including actions taken pursuant to decisions of the Federal Government. Therefore, a statement that emissions from a proposed Federal action represent only a small fraction of global emissions is essentially a statement about the nature of the climate change challenge, and is not an appropriate basis for deciding whether or to what extent to consider climate change impacts under NEPA. Moreover, these comparisons are also not an appropriate method for characterizing the potential impacts associated with a proposed action and its alternatives and mitigations because this approach does not reveal anything beyond the nature of the climate change challenge itself:

the fact that diverse individual sources of emissions each make a relatively small addition to global atmospheric GHG concentrations that collectively have a large impact.

The EPA has also rejected that same kind of analysis because cumulative effects would always dilute individual timber sale effects. (USDA Forest Service, 2016d at pp. 818-19).

So the FS must quantify greenhouse gas emissions. The agency can only use a qualitative method if tools, methodologies, or data inputs are not reasonably available, and if that is the case, there needs be rationale as to why a quantitative analysis is not warranted. There are plenty of quantitative tools for this analysis. See https://ceq.doe.gov/guidance/ghg-accounting-tools.html; USDA 2014. We seen nothing in the PA to indicate the FS is acting in consistency with this guidance.

Logging harms potential of forest ecosystems to sequester carbon and mitigate effects of climate change

The 2012 Planning Rule recognizes, in its definition of Ecosystem services, the "Benefits people obtain from ecosystems, including: (2) Regulating services, such as long term storage of carbon; climate regulation…" The Committee of Scientists, 1999 recognize the importance of forests for their contribution to global climate regulation.

McKinley et al., 2011, state:

- …most of the aboveground carbon stocks are retained after fire in dead tree biomass, because fire typically only consumes the leaves and small twigs, the litter layer or duff, and some dead trees and logs.

- Generally, harvesting forests with high biomass and planting a new forest will reduce overall carbon stocks more than if the forest were retained, even counting the carbon storage in harvested wood products (Harmon et al. 1996, Harmon et al. 2009). Thinning increases the size and vigor of individual trees, but generally reduces net carbon storage rates and carbon storage at the stand level (Schonau and Coetzee 1989, Dore et al. 2010).

- Methane release from anaerobic decomposition of wood and paper in landfills reduces the benefit of storing carbon because methane has about 25 times more global warming potential than CO2. For some paper, the global warming potential of methane release exceeds its carbon storage potential,

- There are two views regarding the science on carbon savings through fuel treatments. Some studies have shown that thinned stands have much higher tree survival and lower carbon losses in a crown fire (Hurteau et al. 2008) or have used modeling to estimate lower carbon losses from thinned stands if they were to burn (Finkral and Evans 2008, Hurteau and North 2009, Stephens et al. 2009). However, other stand-level studies have not shown a carbon benefit from fuel treatments (Reinhardt et al. 2010), and evidence from landscape-level modeling suggests that fuel treatments in most forests will decrease carbon (Harmon et al. 2009, Mitchell et al. 2009) even if the thinned trees are used for

biomass energy. Because the occurrence of fires cannot be predicted at the stand level, treating forest stands without accounting for the probability of stand-replacing fire could result in lower carbon stocks than in untreated stands (Hanson et al. 2009, Mitchell et al. 2009). More research is urgently needed to resolve these different conclusions because thinning to reduce fuel is a widespread forest management practice in the United States (Battaglia et al. 2010).

Logging, especially large trees as the PA proposes, would exacerbate climate change. Mildrexler, et al., 2020 state:

- Large-diameter trees store disproportionally massive amounts of carbon and are a major driver of carbon cycle dynamics in forests worldwide.

- We examined the proportion of large-diameter trees on National Forest lands east of the Cascade Mountains crest in Oregon and Washington, their contribution to overall aboveground carbon (AGC) storage, and the potential reduction in carbon stocks resulting from widespread harvest. We analyzed forest inventory data collected on 3,335 plots and found that large trees play a major role in the accumulated carbon stock of these forests. Tree AGC (kg) increases sharply with tree diameter at breast height (DBH; cm) among five dominant tree species. Large trees accounted for 2.0 to 3.7% of all stems (DBH ≥ 1" or 2.54 cm) among five tree species; but held 33 to 46% of the total AGC stored by each species. Pooled across the five dominant species, large trees accounted for 3% of the 636,520 trees occurring on the inventory plots but stored 42% of the total AGC. A recently proposed large-scale vegetation management project that involved widespread harvest of large trees, mostly grand fir, would have removed ~44% of the AGC stored in these large-diameter trees, and released a large amount of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere.

- Given the urgency of keeping additional carbon out of the atmosphere and continuing carbon accumulation from the atmosphere to protect the climate system, it would be prudent to continue protecting ecosystems with large trees for their carbon stores, and also for their co-benefits of habitat for biodiversity, resilience to drought and fire, and microclimate buffering under future climate extremes.

See also DeLuca, 2009. Also, Lutz et al., 2018 (co-authored by dozens of scientists) "recommend managing forests for conservation of existing large-diameter trees or those that can soon reach large diameters as a simple way to conserve and potentially enhance ecosystem services." DeLuca, 2009 points to research that "showed that if the objective of management is carbon storage, old-growth forests are better left standing. …Old growth, rather than being thought of as stagnant with respect to carbon fixation, can sequester atmospheric carbon dioxide long past the achievement of old-growth conditions."

One value the 1989 Chief's Position Statement on National Forest Old Growth Values did not anticipate is forests' contributions toward a stable climate. Given the dire climate crisis in which we find ourselves, and in order to serve all other values, the FS must analyze and disclose the carbon sequestration potential of the landscapes and ecosystems within which old growth is

found.

Law and Moomaw, 2023 state: “Forests are critically important for slowing climate change. They remove huge quantities of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere – 30% of all fossil fuel emissions annually – and store carbon in trees and soils. Old and mature forests are especially important: They handle droughts, storms and wildfires better than young trees, and they store more carbon.”

Law et al. (2022), in a paper entitled “Creating Strategic Reserves to Protect Forest Carbon and Reduce Biodiversity Losses in the United States” assert that “many of the current and proposed forest management actions in the United States are not consistent with climate goals, and that preserving 30 to 50% of lands for their carbon, biodiversity and water is feasible, effective, and necessary for achieving them.”

In a January 12, 2023 News Release, scientists (Birdsey et al., 2023) point out that “Mature Federal Forests Play an Outsized Role in the Nation’s Climate Strategy.” They state:

> A new study published in the peer-reviewed journal Forests and Global Change presents the nation’s first assessment of carbon stored in larger trees and mature forests on 11 national forests from the West Coast states to the Appalachian Mountains. This study is a companion to prior work to define, inventory and assess the nation’s older forests published in a special feature on “natural forests for a safe climate” in the same journal. Both studies are in response to President Biden’s Executive Order to inventory mature and old-growth forests for conservation purposes and the global concern about the unprecedented decline of older trees.

At a time when species are going extinct faster than any period in human history, the survival of species and persistence of healthy ecosystems requires science-based decisions. A new analysis by NatureServe addresses five essential questions about biodiversity–the variety of life on Earth–that need to be answered if we are going to effectively conserve nature. In the first report of its kind, *NatureServe, 2023* reveals an alarming conclusion: **34% of plants** and **40% of animals** are at risk of extinction, and **41% of ecosystems** are at risk of range-wide collapse. The analyses presented in the report inform how to effectively and efficiently use our financial resources to make the best conservation decisions.

In 2022 over 90 scientists working at the intersection of ecosystems and climate change sent a letter to Canada’s Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, “Regarding the Protection of Canada’s Primary Forests.” They state:

> When primary forests, whether in Canada or elsewhere, are logged they release significant amounts of carbon dioxide, exacerbating climate change. Because primary forest ecosystems store more carbon than secondary forests, replacing primary forests with younger stands, as Canada is doing, ultimately reduces the forest ecosystem’s overall carbon stocks, contributing to atmospheric greenhouse gas levels.
>
> Even if a clearcut forest eventually regrows, it can take over a decade to return to being a

> net absorber of carbon, and the overall carbon debt in carbon stocks that were removed from older forests can take centuries to repay, a luxury we simply no longer have. Recent studies also indicate that soil disturbance associated with logging results in large emissions of methane (CH4), a powerful greenhouse gas second only to CO2 in its climate forcing effects.

In a scientific finding contradicting typical FS logging justifications, Harmon et al. (2022), showed the vast majority of carbon stored in trees before two large wildfires in California's Sierra Nevada mountain range remained there after the fires.

The FS must reevaluate its normal assumptions about its proposed vegetation manipulations in regards to restocking success and species composition. Significant controversy exists as to the need for such manipulations given the improper use and reliance on historic conditions. In fact, there is a high likelihood based on the aforementioned studies that some areas will not regenerate and will instead result in conversion to different vegetative groups. NEPA mandates that an EIS address this controversy and the science contradicting agency assumptions.

Moomaw and Smith, 2017 conclude:

> With the serious adverse consequences of a changing climate already occurring, it is important to broaden our view of sustainable forestry to see forests …as complex ecosystems that provide valuable, multiple life-supporting services like clean water, air, flood control, and carbon storage. We have ample policy mechanisms, resources, and funding to support conservation and protection if we prioritize correctly.
>
> …We must commit to a profound transformation, rebuilding forested landscapes that sequester carbon in long-lived trees and permanent soils. Forests that protect the climate also allow a multitude of species to thrive, manage water quality and quantity and protect our most vulnerable communities from the harshest effects of a changing climate.
>
> Protecting and expanding forests is not an "offset" for fossil fuel emissions. To avoid serious climate disruption, it is essential that we simultaneously reduce emissions of carbon dioxide from burning fossil fuels and bioenergy along with other heat trapping gases and accelerate the removal of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere by protecting and expanding forests. It is not one or the other. It is both!
>
> Achieving the scale of forest protection and restoration needed over the coming decades may be a challenging concept to embrace politically; however, forests are the only option that can operate at the necessary scale and within the necessary time frame to keep the world from going over the climate precipice. Unlike the fossil fuel companies, whose industry must be replaced, the wood products industry will still have an important role to play in providing the wood products that we need while working together to keep more forests standing for their climate, water, storm protection, and biodiversity benefits.
>
> It may be asking a lot to "rethink the forest economy" and to "invest in forest stewardship," but tabulating the multiple benefits of doing so will demonstrate that often a forest is worth

> much more standing than logged. Instead of subsidizing the logging of forests for lumber, paper and fuel, society should pay for the multiple benefits of standing forests. It is time to value U.S. forests differently in the twenty-first century. We have a long way to go, but there is not a lot of time to get there.

Climate change and its consequences are effectively irreversible which implicates certain legal consequences under NEPA and NFMA and ESA (e.g., 40 CFR § 1502.16; 16 USC §1604(g); 36 CFR §219.12; ESA Section 7; 50 CFR §§402.9, 402.14). All net carbon emissions from logging represent "irretrievable and irreversible commitments of resources."

The FS must recognize or analyze highly relevant information and consider scientific information that questions its underlying assumptions and makes them scientifically controversial. This is compounded by the multitude of timber sales in the IPNF, which represent cumulative effects that could be analyzed for carbon sequestration and global warming impacts at local and regional levels.

Forests are carbon sinks—they store carbon in both the soils and the vegetation. Carbon sinks are important for mitigating the impacts of climate change. The U.S. has many forests owned by the public and managed by the Forest Service. Harvesting wood "represents the majority of [carbon] losses from US forest...." Harris et al. 2016. Additionally, Achat et al. 2015 has estimated that intensive biomass harvests could constitute an important source of carbon transfer from forests to the atmosphere. Pacific Northwest forests hold live tree biomass equivalent or larger than tropical forests. Law and Waring 2015. "Alterations in forest management can contribute to increasing the land sink and decreasing emissions by keeping carbon in high biomass forests, extending harvest cycles, reforestation, and afforestation." Law et al. 2018. The FS must include a genuine carbon accounting of the carbon outputs of the proposed project.

Buotte et al. 2019 published an article prioritizing forest lands for preservation based on "carbon priority ranking with measures of biodiversity." This is new and important information that the FS must consider. The researchers mapped "high carbon priority forests in the western US exhibit features of older, intact forest with high structural diversity[], including carbon density and tree species richness." Here is the map from that article:



FIG. 1. Forested land in the western conterminous United States classified into priority for preservation to mitigate climate change based on the spatial co-occurrence of low vulnerability to drought and fire and low, medium, and high potential carbon sequestration. WA, Washington; ID, Idaho; MT, Montana; OR, Oregon; CA, California; NV, Nevada; UT, Utah; CO, Colorado; AZ, Arizona; NM, New Mexico.

The above ranks the IPNF at medium, with pockets of high. This Forest's potential to sequester carbon is significant. Profita (Jan. 1, 2020).

Logging does not serve to increase carbon sequestration in the future. McKinley et al. 2011 states, "Because forest carbon loss contributes to increasing climate risk and because climate change may impede regeneration following disturbance, avoiding deforestation and promoting regeneration after disturbance should receive high priority as policy considerations." One specific strategy McKinley et al. also discusses is decreasing forest harvests, either by interval or intensity, to increase forest carbon stocks. McKinley et al. 2011 recognizes, "Generally, harvesting forests with high biomass and planting a new forest will reduce overall carbon stocks more than if the forest were retained, even counting the carbon storage in harvested wood products." The strategy of harvesting and replanting might work for southeastern forests, but not for the IPNF. Avoiding deforestation, afforestation, and reducing harvest are the first three strategies that McKinley et al. 2011 list. McKinley et al. 2011 recognizes that avoiding deforestation and reducing harvest as strategies for carbon storage in forests, acknowledging that climate change may impede regeneration, contradicting the FS's representation of it.

The FS's position is that individual projects would have insignificant contributions to global carbon emissions. The obvious problem with that viewpoint is, once can say the same thing about every source of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emission on earth, and likewise justify inaction. In their comments on the KNF's Draft EIS for the Lower Yaak, O'Brien, Sheep project, the EPA rejected that sort of analysis, basically because that cumulative effects scale dilutes project effects. (See USDA Forest Service, 2016d at 818-19.) We would add that, if the

FS wants to refer to a wider scope to analyze its carbon footprint, we suggest that it actually conduct such a cumulative effect analysis and disclose it in a NEPA document.

Depro et al., 2008 found that ending commercial logging on U.S. national forests and allowing forests to mature instead would remove an additional amount of carbon from the atmosphere equivalent to 6 percent of the U.S. 2025 climate target of 28 percent emission reductions.

Forest recovery following logging and natural disturbances are usually considered a given. But forests have recovered under climatic conditions that no longer exist. Higher global temperatures and increased levels of disturbance are contributing to greater tree mortality in many forest ecosystems, and these same drivers can also limit forest regeneration, leading to vegetation type conversion. (Bart et al., 2016.)

Best available science supports the proposition that forest policies must shift away from logging if carbon sequestration is prioritized.[1] Forests must be preserved indefinitely for their carbon storage value. Forests that have been logged should be allowed to convert to eventual old-growth condition. Such management has the potential to double the current level of carbon storage in some regions. (See Harmon and Marks, 2002; Harmon, 2001; Harmon et al., 1990; Homann et al., 2005; Law, 2014; Solomon et al., 2008; Turner et al., 1995; Turner et al., 1997; Woodbury et al., 2007.)

Moomaw and Smith, 2017 state:

> Multiple studies warn that carbon emissions from soil due to logging are significant, yet under-reported. One study found that logging or clear-cutting a forest can cause carbon emissions from soil disturbance for up to fifty years. Ongoing research by an N.C. State University scientist studying soil emissions from logging on Weyerhaeuser land in North Carolina suggests that "logging, whether for biofuels or lumber, is eating away at the carbon stored beneath the forest floor."

Moomaw and Smith, 2017 examined the scientific evidence implicating forest biomass removal as contributing to climate change:

> All plant material releases slightly more carbon per unit of heat produced than coal. Because plants produce heat at a lower temperature than coal, wood used to produce electricity produces up to 50 percent more carbon than coal per unit of electricity.

---

[1] "More logging and reforestation occur annually in the U.S., including on our public lands, than in any other nation in the world." John Muir Project of Earth Island Institute 2018. *Protecting Forests from Logging: The Missing Piece Necessary to Combat Climate Change*. *See also* Hansen et al 2013 High-resolution Global Maps of 21st-Century Forest Cover Change. Science 342: 850-853; Prestemon, J.P., et al. 2015. The global position of the U.S. forest products industry.

> Trees are harvested, dried, and transported using fossil fuels. These emissions add about 20 percent or more to the carbon dioxide emissions associated with combustion.

Keith et al., 2009 state:

> Both net primary production and net ecosystem production in many old forest stands have been found to be positive; they were lower than the carbon fluxes in young and mature stands, but not significantly different from them. Northern Hemisphere forests up to 800 years old have been found to still function as a carbon sink. Carbon stocks can continue to accumulate in multi-aged and mixed species stands because stem respiration rates decrease with increasing tree size, and continual turnover of leaves, roots, and woody material contribute to stable components of soil organic matter. There is a growing body of evidence that forest ecosystems do not necessarily reach an equilibrium between assimilation and respiration, but can continue to accumulate carbon in living biomass, coarse woody debris, and soils, and therefore may act as net carbon sinks for long periods. Hence, process-based models of forest growth and carbon cycling based on an assumption that stands are even-aged and carbon exchange reaches an equilibrium may underestimate productivity and carbon accumulation in some forest types. Conserving forests with large stocks of biomass from deforestation and degradation avoids significant carbon emissions to the atmosphere. Our insights into forest types and forest conditions that result in high biomass carbon density can be used to help identify priority areas for conservation and restoration.

Hanson, 2010 addresses some of the false notions often misrepresented as “best science” by agencies, extractive industries and the politicians they’ve bought:

> Our forests are functioning as carbon sinks (net sequestration) where logging has been reduced or halted, and wildland fire helps maintain high productivity and carbon storage.
>
> Even large, intense fires consume less than 3% of the biomass in live trees, and carbon emissions from forest fires is only tiny fraction of the amount resulting from fossil fuel consumption (even these emissions are balanced by carbon uptake from forest growth and regeneration).
>
> "Thinning" operations for lumber or biofuels do not increase carbon storage but, rather, reduce it, and thinning designed to curb fires further threatens imperiled wildlife species that depend upon post-fire habitat.

Campbell et al., 2012 also refutes the notion that fuel-reduction treatments increase forest carbon storage in the western US:

> It has been suggested that thinning trees and other fuel-reduction practices aimed at reducing the probability of high-severity forest fire are consistent with efforts to keep carbon (C) sequestered in terrestrial pools, and that such practices should therefore be rewarded rather than penalized in C-accounting schemes. By evaluating how fuel treatments, wildfire, and their interactions affect forest C stocks across a wide range of spatial and temporal scales, we conclude that this is extremely unlikely. Our review reveals

> high C losses associated with fuel treatment, only modest differences in the combustive losses associated with high-severity fire and the low-severity fire that fuel treatment is meant to encourage, and a low likelihood that treated forests will be exposed to fire. Although fuel-reduction treatments may be necessary to restore historical functionality to fire-suppressed ecosystems, we found little credible evidence that such efforts have the added benefit of increasing terrestrial C stocks.

Mitchell et al. (2009) also refutes the assertion that logging to reduce fire hazard helps store carbon, and conclude that although thinning can affect fire, management activities are likely to remove more carbon by logging than will be stored by trying to prevent fire.

Harmon, 2009 is the written record of "Testimony Before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands of the Committee of Natural Resources for an oversight hearing on The Role of Federal Lands in Combating Climate Change." The author "reviews, in terms as simple as possible, how the forest system stores carbon, the issues that need to be addressed when assessing any proposed action, and some common misconceptions that need to be avoided." His testimony begins, "I am here to …offer my expertise to the subcommittee. I am a professional scientist, having worked in the area of forest carbon for nearly three decades. During that time I have conducted numerous studies on many aspects of this problem, have published extensively, and provided instruction to numerous students, forest managers, and the general public."

Climate change science suggests that logging for sequestration of carbon, logging to reduce wild fire, and other manipulation of forest stands does not offer benefits to climate. Rather, increases in carbon emissions from soil disturbance and drying out of forest floors are the result. The FS must minimize manipulation of forest stands, especially stands that have not been previously logged, allowing natural processes to function. Furthermore, logging involves the burning of fossil fuels. Reducing fossil fuel combustion is vital. Everything from travel planning to monitoring would have an important impact in that realm.

Old growth also helps to mitigate the effects of climate change on wildlife habitat. Frey et al., 2016 find: "Vegetation characteristics associated with older forest stands appeared to confer a strong, thermally insulating effect. Older forests with tall canopies, high biomass, and vertical complexity provided cooler microclimates compared with simplified stands. This resulted in differences as large as 2.5°C between plantation sites and old-growth sites, a temperature range equivalent to predicted global temperature increases over the next 50 years." They believe older, more complex forests may help to "buffer organisms from the impacts of regional warming and/or slow the rate at which organisms must adapt to a changing climate…" Large trees serve as important carbon capture and storage (Stephenson et al. 2014). Also see DellaSala and Baker, 2020 and Scientists Letter, 2020. Additionally, forest canopies can buffer climate extremes and promote microclimates that in turn provide refugia for species in the understory—on a daily basis, buffering is most strongly related to forest cover. (Davis et al. 2019b.)

Given the urgency of preventing additional greenhouse gas emissions and continuing carbon sequestration to mitigate climate change, it would be best to protect large trees for their carbon

stores, and also for their co-benefits of habitat for biodiversity, resilience to drought and fire, and microclimate buffering under future climate extremes.

Law and Moomaw (2021) assert: "Keeping trees in the ground where they are already growing is an effective low-tech way to slow climate change."

Achat et al. 2015 state, "Compared with other terrestrial ecosystems, forests store some of the largest quantities of carbon per surface area of land." Much stored carbon is within soils. (Id.) Forest management can modify soil organic carbon stocks, losing soil organic carbon when comparing conventional harvests like clearcutting or shelterwood cutting with unharvested forests. (Id.) Not only does it lose the carbon stored in the soils, but cutting trees eliminates the trees' potential to continue to sequester carbon. (Id.)

Logging and associated activities emit vast amounts of greenhouse gases

Van der Werf, et al. 2009 discuss the effects of land-management practices and state:

> (T)he maximum reduction in CO2 emissions from avoiding deforestation and forest degradation is probably about 12% of current total anthropogenic emissions (or 15% if peat degradation is included) - and that is assuming, unrealistically, that emissions from deforestation, forest degradation and peat degradation can be completely eliminated.
>
> ...reducing fossil fuel emissions remains the key element for stabilizing atmospheric CO2 concentrations.
>
> (E)fforts to mitigate emissions from tropical forests and peatlands, and maintain existing terrestrial carbon stocks, remain critical for the negotiation of a post-Kyoto agreement. Even our revised estimates represent substantial emissions ...

Interaction of management actions and climate change

Vegetation management efforts that propose attempting to replicate pre-European conditions ignores the larger pattern of climate, ignores climate change, and ignores natural succession. Millar and Wolfenden 1999 discuss important patterns within the context of climate change.

The FS (in USDA Forest Service, 2017b) discusses some effects of climate change on forests, including the following statement "In many areas, it will no longer be possible to maintain vegetation within the historical range of variability. Land management approaches based on current or historical conditions will need to be adjusted." Yet, the PA lacks any acknowledgement, awareness or analysis that achieving the desired conditions is very much climate dependent. The PA has no scientific basis to support its assumption that proposed "treatments" will result in sustainable vegetation conditions under increasing temperatures.

Furthermore, the FS doesn't present a scientific basis to support its assumption that proposed "treatments" will result in sustainable vegetation conditions under increasing temperatures. Browne et al., 2019 discussed that adaptational lag to temperature in valley oak (Quercus lobata) can be mitigated by genome-informed assisted gene flow. Even using seed source from local

species may not hold for management practices because trees can lag in adapting to temperature. This has not been accounted for.

The PA fails to consider that the effects of climate change on the project area, including that the target "historical" or desired vegetation conditions will likely not be achievable or sustainable. The PA fails to provide any credible analysis as to how realistic and achievable its objectives are in the context of a rapidly changing climate, along an unpredictable but definitely changing trajectory.

The PA fails to analyze and disclose how climate change is already, and is expected to be even more in the future, influence forest ecology. This has vast ramifications as to whether or not the forest in the project area will respond as the FS assumes.

The PA fails to acknowledge the possibility that "…high seedling and sapling mortality rates due to water stress, competing vegetation, and repeat fires that burn young stands," which will likely lead to a dramatic increase in non-forest land acres. (Johnson, et al., 2016.)

There is scientific certainty that climate change has reset the deck for future ecological conditions. For example, Sallabanks, et al., 2001:

> (L)ong-term evolutionary potentials can be met only by accounting for potential future changes in conditions. …Impending changes in regional climates …have the capacity for causing great shifts in composition of ecological communities.

Conventional wisdom dictates that forests regenerate and recover from wildfire, and that forests can regenerate and recover from logging. And these days, "resilience" is a core tenant of FS planning. Unfortunately, assumptions relating to historic and desired conditions are incorrect. NEPA requires a "hard look" at the best available science relating to future concentrations of greenhouse gases and gathering climate risk as we move forward into an increasingly uncertain and uncharted climate future. This has not been done. The PA does not include a legitimate climate-risk analysis, much less one based on the best available science.

No amount of logging, thinning and prescribes burning will cure the cumulative effects (irretrievable loss) already baked into the foreseeably impending climate chaos. "Treatments" must be acknowledged for what they are: adverse cumulative environmental effects. Logging can neither mitigate, nor prevent, the effects of wildfire or logging. Both disturb forests, and the assumed resilience no longer exists. It is way too late ignore the elephant in the room.

Millar et al. 2007 state:

> Over the last several decades, forest managers in North America have used concepts of historical range of variability, natural range of variability, and ecological sustainability to set goals and inform management decisions. An underlying premise in these approaches is that by maintaining forest conditions within the range of presettlement conditions, managers are most likely to sustainably maintain forests into the future. We argue that although we have important lessons to learn from the past, we cannot rely on past forest

> conditions to provide us with adequate targets for current and future management. This reality must be considered in policy, planning, and management. Climate variability, both naturally caused and anthropogenic, as well as modern land-use practices and stressors, create novel environmental conditions never before experienced by ecosystems. Under such conditions, historical ecology suggests that we manage for species persistence within large ecoregions.

The PA fails to consider that the effects of climate change on the project area, including that FS target HRV or desired vegetation conditions will likely not be achievable or sustainable. The FS is obligated to conduct an analysis as to how realistic and achievable its objectives are in the context of a rapidly changing climate, along an unpredictable but definitely changing trajectory.

Other forest activities emit greenhouse gases

The FS must quantify CO_2 and other greenhouse gas emissions from other common human activities related to forest management and recreational uses. These include emissions associated with machines used for logging and associated activities, vehicle use for administrative actions, recreational motor vehicles, and emissions associated with livestock grazing. The FS is simply ignoring the climate impacts of those management actions and other authorized or allowed activities.

The FS has refused to even attempt to cumulatively examine the effects, which is significant as the Northern Region has been approving many supersized clearcuts across the national forests of Montana and Northern Idaho. *See* Bilodeau and Juel, 2021. This region has approved over 93,000 acres of supersized clearcuts just in the last seven years. How much carbon stores would that eliminate? How much fossil fuel would be burned in the clearcutting of that acreage?

There exist quantitative tools for such analyses, such as Eve, et al., 2014. There is nothing in the PA to indicate the FS is accounting for greenhouse gases in any legitimate, quantitative manner.

It is crucial not only to protect old and mature forests, but to ensure early and mid-seral stands can grow into new those conditions, especially since the FS has admitted, regarding mature forests in Alaska, such forests "likely store considerably more carbon compared to younger forests in this area (within the individual trees themselves as well as within the organic soil layer found in mature forests)." (USDA Forest Service, 2016h.) This is because when a forest is cut, the vast majority of the stored carbon in the forest is released over time as CO_2, thereby converting forests from a sink to a "source" or "emitter." See, e.g., DellaSala, 2021.

Recent studies agree that maintaining forests rather than cutting them down can help reduce the impacts of climate change. E.g., Moomaw, et al., 2019: "Stakeholders and policy makers need to recognize that **the way to maximize carbon storage and sequestration is to grow intact forest ecosystems where possible**." (Emphasis added). Another report (Hudiburg et al., 2019) concludes:

> **Allowing forests to reach their biological potential for growth and sequestration, maintaining large trees** (Lutz et al 2018), reforesting recently cut lands, and afforestation of suitable areas **will remove additional CO2 from the atmosphere**. Global vegetation

> stores of carbon are 50% of their potential including western forests because of harvest activities (Erb et al 2017). Clearly, western forests could do more to address climate change through carbon sequestration **if allowed to grow longer**. (Emphasis added.)

In a literature review from leading experts on forest carbon storage, Law, et al. (2020) reported:

> There is absolutely no evidence that thinning forests increases biomass stored (Zhou et al. 2013). It takes decades to centuries for carbon to accumulate in forest vegetation and soils (Sun et al. 2004, Hudiburg et al. 2009, Schlesinger 2018), and it takes decades to centuries for dead wood to decompose. We must preserve medium to high biomass (carbon-dense) forest not only because of their carbon potential but also because they have the greatest biodiversity of forest species (Krankina et al. 2014, Buotte et al. 2019, 2020).

Also *see* Dr. Law explaining these matters in the video, "The Surprising Truth Behind Planting Trees and Climate Change" submitted on data disk as part of this objection.

Law and Moomaw, 2021 recently concluded:

> Recent projections show that to prevent the worst impacts of climate change, governments will have to increase their pledges to reduce carbon emissions by as much as 80%. We see the next 10 to 20 years as a critical window for climate action, and believe that **permanent protection for mature and old forests is the greatest opportunity for near-term climate benefits.** (Emphasis added.)

Logging also doesn't increase carbon storage in the US by reducing future fire emissions. Research has found high carbon losses associated with "fuel treatment" and only modest differences associated with the high-severity fire and low severity fire that fuel treatment is meant to encourage. Campbell et al. 2012. And where some disturbances like insects, disease, and fire kill trees and lower carbon sequestration, logging has the greater impact--up to ten times the carbon from forest fires and bark beetles together. *See* Harris et al. 2016. Please do an analysis that recognizes this.

Also, logging does not keep carbon out of the atmosphere. The below graphic is from the Josephine County Democrats Webpage, Forest Defense is Climate Defense (https://josephinedemocrats.org/forest-defense-is-climate-defense/), where the illustrator used the information in Gower et al. 2003 and Smith et al. 2006 to create the following illustration of how carbon is lost into the atmosphere from logging.



The importance of trees for carbon capture will rise especially if, as recent evidence suggests, hopes for soils as a carbon sink may be overly optimistic. (He et al., 2016) Such a potentially reduced role of soils doesn't mean that forest soils won't have a role in capture and storage of carbon, rather it puts more of the onus on aboveground sequestration by trees, even if there is a conversion to unfamiliar mixes of trees.

Forests affect the climate, climate affects the forests, and there's been increasing evidence of climate triggering forest cover loss at significant scales (Breshears et al. 2005), forcing tree species into new distributions "unfamiliar to modern civilization" (Williams et al. 2012), and raising a question of forest decline across the 48 United States (Cohen et al. 2016).

In 2012 Forest Service scientists reported, "Climate change will alter ecosystem services, perceptions of value, and decisions regarding land uses." (Vose et al. 2012.)

The 2014 National Climate Assessment chapter for the Northwest is prefaced by four "key messages" including this one: "The combined impacts of increasing wildfire, insect outbreaks, and tree diseases are already causing widespread tree die-off and are virtually certain to cause additional forest mortality by the 2040s and long-term transformation of forest landscapes. Under higher emissions scenarios, extensive conversion of subalpine forests to other forest types is projected by the 2080s." (Mote et al. 2014.)

None of this means that longstanding values such as conservation of old-growth forests are no longer important. Under increasing heat and its consequences, we're likely to get unfamiliar understory and canopy comprised of a different mix of species. This new assortment of plant

species will plausibly entail a new mix of trees, because some familiar tree species on the Forest may not be viable—or as viable—under emerging climate conditions.

That said, the plausible new mix will include trees for whom the best policy will be in allowing them to achieve their longest possible lifespan, for varied reasons including that big trees will still serve as important carbon capture and storage (Stephenson et al. 2014).

Managing forest lands with concerns for water will be increasingly difficult under new conditions expected for the 21st century. (Sun and Vose, 2016.) Already, concerns have focused on new extremes of low flow in streams. (Kormos et al. 2016.) The 2014 National Climate Assessment Chapter for the Northwest also recognizes hydrologic challenges ahead: "Changes in the timing of streamflow related to changing snowmelt are already observed and will continue, reducing the supply of water for many competing demands and causing far-reaching ecological and socioeconomic consequences." (Mote et al. 2014.)

Malmsheimer et al. 2008 state, "Forests are shaped by climate. Along with soils, aspect, inclination, and elevation, climate determines what will grow where and how well. Changes in temperature and precipitation regimes therefore have the potential to dramatically affect forests nationwide."

Kirilenko and Sedjo, 2007 state "The response of forestry to global warming is likely to be multifaceted. On some sites, species more appropriate to the climate will replace the earlier species that is no longer suited to the climate."

Some FS scientists recognize this changing situation, for instance Johnson, 2016:

> Forests are changing in ways they've never experienced before because today's growing conditions are different from anything in the past. The climate is changing at an unprecedented rate, exotic diseases and pests are present, and landscapes are fragmented by human activity often occurring at the same time and place.
>
> The current drought in California serves as a reminder and example that forests of the 21st century may not resemble those from the 20th century. "When replanting a forest after disturbances, does it make sense to try to reestablish what was there before? Or, should we find re-plant material that might be more appropriate to current and future conditions of a changing environment?
>
> "Restoration efforts on U.S. Forest Service managed lands call for the use of locally adapted and appropriate native seed sources. The science-based process for selecting these seeds varies, but in the past, managers based decisions on the assumption that present site conditions are similar to those of the past.
>
> "This may no longer be the case."

Westerling, et al. 2006 state:

> Robust statistical associations between wildfire and hydro-climate in western forests indicate that increased wildfire activity over recent decades reflects sub-regional responses to changes in climate. Historical wildfire observations exhibit an abrupt transition in the mid-1980s from a regime of infrequent large wildfires of short (average of one week) duration to one with much more frequent and longer-burning (five weeks) fires. This transition was marked by a shift toward unusually warm springs, longer summer dry seasons, drier vegetation (which provoked more and longer-burning large wildfires), and longer fire seasons. Reduced winter precipitation and an early spring snowmelt played a role in this shift. Increases in wildfire were particularly strong in mid-elevation forests. …The greatest increases occurred in mid-elevation, Northern Rockies forests, where land-use histories have relatively little effect on fire risks, and are strongly associated with increased spring and summer temperatures and an earlier spring snowmelt.

Running, 2006 cites model runs of future climate scenarios from the 4th Assessment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, stating:

> (S)even general circulation models have run future climate simulations for several different carbon emissions scenarios. These simulations unanimously project June to August temperature increases of 2° to 5°C by 2040 to 2069 for western North America. The simulations also project precipitation decreases of up to 15% for that time period (*11*). Even assuming the most optimistic result of no change in precipitation, a June to August temperature increase of 3°C would be roughly three times the spring-summer temperature increase that Westerling *et al.* have linked to the current trends. Wildfire burn areas in Canada are expected to increase by 74 to 118% in the next century (*12*), and similar increases seem likely for the western United States.

The Pacific Northwest Research Station, 2004 recognizes "(a) way that climate change may show up in forests is through changes in disturbance regimes—the long-term patterns of fire, drought, insects, and diseases that are basic to forest development."

The District Court of Montana ruled in Case 4:17-cv-00030-BMM that the Federal government was required to evaluate the climate change impacts of the federal government coal program.

In March 2019, U.S. District Judge Rudolph Contreras in Washington, D.C., ruled that when the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) auctions public lands for oil and gas leasing, officials must consider emissions from past, present and foreseeable future oil and gas leases nationwide.

In March of 2018 the Federal District Court of Montana found the Miles City (Montana) and Buffalo (Wyoming) Field Office's Resource Management Plans unlawfully overlooked climate impacts of coal mining and oil and gas drilling. The case was brought by Western Organization of Resource Councils, Montana Environmental Information Center, Powder River Basin Resource Council, Northern Plains Resource Council, the Sierra Club, and the Natural Resources Defense Council.

Davis et al., 2019 state:

> At dry sites across our study region, seasonal to annual climate conditions over the past 20 years have crossed these thresholds, such that conditions have become increasingly unsuitable for regeneration. High fire severity and low seed availability further reduced the probability of postfire regeneration. Together, our results demonstrate that climate change combined with high severity fire is leading to increasingly fewer opportunities for seedlings to establish after wildfires and may lead to ecosystem transitions in low-elevation ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir forests across the western United States.

Forests are already experiencing emissions-driven deforestation, on both the post-fire and post-logging acreage.

The FS must consider recent restocking monitoring data and analysis.

The issue of forest response to climate change is also of course an issue of broad importance to community vitality and economic sustainability. Raising a question about persistence of forest stands also raises questions about hopes—and community economic planning—for the sustainability of forest-dependent jobs. Allen et al., 2015 state:

> Patterns, mechanisms, projections, and consequences of tree mortality and associated broad-scale forest die-off due to drought accompanied by warmer temperatures—hotter drought", an emerging characteristic of the Anthropocene—are the focus of rapidly expanding literature.
>
> …(R)ecent studies document more rapid mortality under hotter drought due to negative tree physiological responses and accelerated biotic attacks. Additional evidence suggesting greater vulnerability includes rising background mortality rates; projected increases in drought frequency, intensity, and duration; limitations of vegetation models such as inadequately represented mortality processes; warming feedbacks from die-off; and wildfire synergies.
>
> …We also present a set of global vulnerability drivers that are known with high confidence: (1) droughts eventually occur everywhere; (2) warming produces hotter droughts; (3) atmospheric moisture demand increases nonlinearly with temperature during drought; (4) mortality can occur faster in hotter drought, consistent with fundamental physiology; (5) shorter droughts occur more frequently than longer droughts and can become lethal under warming, increasing the frequency of lethal drought nonlinearly; and (6) mortality happens rapidly relative to growth intervals needed for forest recovery.
>
> These high-confidence drivers, in concert with research supporting greater vulnerability perspectives, support an overall viewpoint of greater forest vulnerability globally. We surmise that mortality vulnerability is being discounted in part due to difficulties in predicting threshold responses to extreme climate events. Given the profound ecological and societal implications of underestimating global vulnerability to hotter drought, we highlight urgent challenges for research, management, and policy-making communities.

Heat, a long-established topic of physics, plays an equally important role at the level of plant and animal physiology—every organism only survives and thrives within thermal limits. For example, Pörtner et al. (2008) point out, "All organisms live within a limited range of body temperatures… Direct effects of climatic warming can be understood through fatal decrements in an organism's performance in growth, reproduction, foraging, immune competence, behaviors and competitiveness." The authors further explain, "Performance in animals is supported by aerobic scope, the increase in oxygen consumption rate from resting to maximal." In other words, rising heat has the same effect on animals as reducing the oxygen supply, and creates the same difficulties in breathing. But breathing difficulties brought on by heat can have important consequences even at sub-lethal levels. In the case of grizzly bears, increased demand for oxygen under increasing heat has implications for vigorous (aerobically demanding) activity including digging, running in pursuit of prey, mating, and the play of cubs.

Respected experts say that the atmosphere might be able to safely hold 350 ppm of CO_2.[2] So when the atmosphere was at pre-industrial levels of about 280 ppm, there was a cushion of about 70 ppm which represents millions of tons of greenhouse gas emissions. Well, now that cushion is completely gone. The atmosphere is now over 400 ppm CO_2 and rising. Therefore the safe level of additional emissions (from logging or any other activity) is negative. There is no safe level of additional emissions that our earth systems can tolerate. We need to be removing carbon from the atmosphere—not adding to it.[3] How? By allowing forests to grow. Logging moves us away from our objective while conservation moves us toward our objective.

Pecl, et al. 2017 "review the consequences of climate-driven species redistribution for economic development and the provision of ecosystem services, including livelihoods, food security, and culture, as well as for feedbacks on the climate itself." They state, "Despite mounting evidence for the pervasive and substantial impacts of a climate-driven redistribution of Earth's species, current global goals, policies, and international agreements fail to account for these effects. … To date, all key international discussions and agreements regarding climate change have focused on the direct socioeconomic implications of emissions reduction and on funding mechanisms; **shifting natural ecosystems have not yet been considered in detail**." (Emphasis added.)

The following figure is from a report by the Union of Concerned Scientists & Rocky Mountain Climate Organization (Funk et al., 2014):

[2] http://www.350.org/about/science.

[3] "To get back to 350 ppm, we'll have to run the whole carbon-spewing machine backwards, sucking carbon out of the atmosphere and storing it somewhere safely. … By growing more forests, growing more trees, and better managing all our forests…" (http://blog.cleanenergy.org/2013/11/26/exploringbiocarbon-tools/comment-page-1/#comment-375371)

FIGURE 5 AND TABLE 1. **Projected Changes in Suitable Ranges for Key Rocky Mountain Tree Species**



Species	Current	2060		
	Recent Historical Suitability (acres)	Projected Suitability (acres)	Net Change in Suitability (acres)	Percent Net Change
Lodgepole Pine	60,474,000	6,065,000	-54,409,000	-90%
Ponderosa Pine	39,842,000	7,771,000	-32,071,000	-80%
Engelmann Spruce	64,651,000	21,999,000	-42,652,000	-66%
Douglas Fir	53,620,000	22,606,000	-31,014,000	-58%

The caption under Funk et al.'s Figure 5 and Table 1 states:

> Much of the current range of these four widespread Rocky Mountain conifer species is projected to become climatically unsuitable for them by 2060 if emissions of heat-trapping gases continue to rise. The map on the left shows areas projected to be climatically suitable for these tree species under the recent historical (1961–1990) climate; the map on the right depicts conditions projected for 2060 given medium-high levels of heat-trapping emissions. Areas in color have at least a 50 percent likelihood of being climatically suitable according to the models, which did not address other factors that affect where species occur (e.g., soil types). Emissions levels reflect the A2 scenario of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. For more about this methodology, see www.ucsusa.org/forestannex.

Pecl, et al. 2017 conclude:

> The breadth and complexity of the issues associated with the global redistribution of species driven by changing climate are creating profound challenges, with species movements already affecting societies and regional economies from the tropics to polar regions. Despite mounting evidence for these impacts, current global goals, policies, and international agreements do not sufficiently consider species range shifts in their formulation or targets. Enhanced awareness, supported by appropriate governance, will provide the best chance of minimizing negative consequences while maximizing opportunities arising from species

movements—movements that, with or without effective emission reduction, will continue for the foreseeable future, owing to the inertia in the climate system.

Moomaw and Smith, 2017 identify the need for forest protection to be an urgent, national priority in the fight against climate change and as a safety net for communities against extreme weather events caused by a changing climate. As those authors explain:

> Global climate change is caused by excess CO_2 and other greenhouse gases transferred to the atmosphere from other pools. Human activities, including combustion of fossil fuels and bioenergy, forest loss and degradation, other land use changes, and industrial processes, have contributed to increasing atmospheric CO_2, the largest contributor to global warming, which will cause temperatures to rise and stay high into the next millennium or longer.
>
> The most recent measurements show the level of atmospheric carbon dioxide has reached 400 parts per million and will likely to remain at that level for millennia to come. Even if all fossil fuel emissions were to cease and all other heat-trapping gases were no longer emitted to the atmosphere, temperatures close to those achieved at the emissions peak would persist for the next millennium or longer.
>
> Meeting the goals of the Paris Agreement now requires the implementation of strategies that result in negative emissions, i.e., extraction of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. In other words, we need to annually remove more carbon dioxide from the atmosphere than we are emitting and store it long-term. Forests and soils are the only proven techniques that can pull vast amounts of carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere and store it at the scale necessary to meet the Paris goal. Failure to reduce biospheric emissions and to restore Earth's natural climate stabilization systems will doom any attempt to meet the Paris (COP21) global temperature stabilization goals.
>
> The most recent U.S. report of greenhouse gas emissions states that our forests currently "offset" 11 to 13 percent of total U.S. annual emissions. That figure is half that of the global average of 25% and only a fraction of what is needed to avoid climate catastrophe. And while the U.S. government and industry continue to argue that we need to increase markets for wood, paper, and biofuel as climate solutions, the rate, scale, and methods of logging in the United States are having significant, negative climate impacts, which are largely being ignored in climate policies at the international, national, state, and local levels.
>
> The actual carbon stored long-term in harvested wood products represents less than 10 percent of that originally stored in the standing trees and other forest biomass. If the trees had been left to grow, the amount of carbon stored would have been even greater than it was 100 years prior. Therefore, from a climate perspective, the atmosphere would be better off if the forest had not been harvested at all. In addition, when wood losses and fossil fuels for processing and transportation are accounted for, carbon emissions can actually exceed carbon stored in wood products.

Climate change science suggests that logging for sequestration of carbon, logging to reduce wild fire, and other manipulation of forest stands does not offer benefits to climate. Rather, increases in carbon emissions from soil disturbance and drying out of forest floors are the result. The FS can best address climate change through minimizing development of forest stands, especially stands that have not been previously logged, by allowing natural processes to function. Furthermore, any supposedly carbon sequestration from logging are usually more than offset by carbon release from ground disturbing activities and from the burning of fossil fuels to accomplish the timber sale, even when couched in the language of restoration. Reducing fossil fuel use is vital. Everything from travel planning to monitoring would have an important impact in that realm.

Funk et al., 2014 indicate that at least five common tree species, including aspens and four conifers, are at great risk unless atmospheric greenhouse gases and associated temperatures can be contained at today's levels of concentration in the atmosphere. It is indeed time to speak honestly about unrealistic expectations relating to desired conditions.

And according to scientific literature it seems highly unlikely that greenhouse gas concentrations and the heat they trap in the atmosphere will be held at current levels.

The FS must consier conditions we can realistically expect as heat trapped by increasing greenhouse gas concentrations steadily tightens its grip—and impacts on forests accrue locally, regionally, nationally, and globally.

The FS must assess and disclose all risks associated with the vegetation manipulation proposed.

NEPA requires disclosure of impact on "the human environment." Climate risk presents overarching adverse impacts on cultural, economic, environmental, and social aspects of the human environment—people, jobs, and the economy—adjacent to and near the Forests. Challenges in predicting responses of individual tree species to climate are a result of species competing under a never-before-seen climate regime that we have not seen before—one forests may not have experienced before either.

Golladay et al., 2016 state, "In an uncertain future of rapid change and abrupt, unforeseen transitions, adjustments in management approaches will be necessary and some actions will fail. However, **it is increasingly evident that the greatest risk is posed by continuing to implement strategies inconsistent with and not informed by current understanding of our novel future**… (Emphasis added).

In the face of increasing climate risk, growing impacts of wildfire and insect activity, plus scientific research findings, the FS must disclose the significant trend in post-fire regeneration failure. The national forests have already experienced considerable difficulty restocking on areas that have been subjected to clear-cut logging, post-fire salvage logging and other even-aged management "systems." NFMA (1982) regulation 36CFR 219.27(c)(3) implements the NFMA statute, and requires restocking in five years.

The FS must address the question of how lands were determined to be suitable for the type of management ongoing or proposed. Please cite the specific documentation that supposedly determined that the specific areas proposed for logging are suitable for timber production.

It's time to analyze and disclose the fact that the FS can no longer "insure that timber will be harvested from the National Forest system lands only where…there is assurance that such lands can be restocked within five years of harvest" [NFMA §6(g)(3)(E)(ii)] because of the impacts of climate change.

Stevens-Rumann, et al., (2018) state: "In the US Rocky Mountains, we documented a significant trend of post-fire tree regeneration, even over the relatively short period of 23 years covered in this analysis. Our findings are consistent with the expectation of **reduced resilience of forest ecosystems to the combined impacts of climate warming and wildfire activity**. Our results suggest that predicted **shifts from forest to non-forested vegetation**. (Emphases added.)

The FS must quantify CO_2 and other greenhouse gas emissions from other common human activities related to forest management and recreational uses. These include emissions associated with machines used for logging and associated activities, vehicle use for administrative actions, recreational motor vehicles, and emissions associated with livestock grazing. The FS is simply ignoring the climate impacts of those management actions and other authorized or allowed activities.

Kassar and Spitler, 2008 provide an analysis of the carbon footprint of off-road vehicles in California. They determined that:

> Off-road vehicles in California currently emit more than 230,000 metric tons — or 5000 million pounds — of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere each year. This is equivalent to the emissions created by burning 500,000 barrels of oil. The 26 million gallons of gasoline consumed by off-road vehicles each year in California is equivalent to the amount of gasoline used by 1.5 million car trips from San Francisco to Los Angeles.
>
> . . . Off-road vehicles emit considerably more pollution than automobiles. According to the California Air Resources Board, off-road motorcycles and all-terrain vehicles produce 118 times as much smog-forming pollutants as do modern automobiles on a per-mile basis.
>
> . . . Emissions from current off-road vehicle use statewide are equivalent to the carbon dioxide emissions from 42,000 passenger vehicles driven for an entire year or the electricity used to power 30,500 homes for one year.

Also, Sylvester, 2014 provides data on the amount of fossil fuel being consumed by snowmobiles in Montana, from which one can calculate the carbon footprint. The study finds that resident snowmobilers burn 3.3 million gallons of gas in their snowmobiles each year and a similar amount of fuel to transport themselves and their snowmobiles to and from their destination. Non-residents annually burn one million gallons of gas in snowmobiles and about twice that in related transportation. So that adds up to 9.6 million gallons of fuel consumed in the pursuit of snowmobiling each year in Montana alone. Multiply that by 20 pounds of carbon

dioxide per gallon of gas (diesel pickups spew 22 pounds per gallon) and snowmobiling releases 192 million pounds (96 thousand tons) of climate-warming CO_2 per year into the atmosphere.

The FS must recognize and analyze highly relevant information or consider the science that questions the PA's underlying assumptions and therefore reveals scientific controversy. It doesn't disclose high-quality information to the public, and it doesn't take a hard look at this proposed action in the manner needed. This is compounded by the multitude of projects on the IPNF, which represent cumulative effects that must be analyzed for carbon sequestration and global warming impacts at local and regional levels.

The FS must overhaul its land management approach to one prioritizing conservation of carbon pools, long-term and short-term, to preserve the atmosphere, the biosphere, and prospects for the survival of civilization.

The project activities will remove trees across a few thousand acres, which requires the FS to quantify the climate impacts in an EIS. At a minimum, the agency must take a hard look at the science and policy we have presented within our comments and objection that demonstrate significant volumes—in some cases a majority—of carbon stored in trees are immediately lost when trees are logged and milled, and the rest is likely to be returned to the atmosphere sooner than would occur if the trees were left standing, eliminating any alleged benefits from storing carbon in wood products.

Sincerely submitted,

Jeff Juel, Forest Policy Director
Friends of the Clearwater
509-688-5956
jeffjuel@wildrockies.org

And on behalf of:
Adam Rissien, ReWilding Manager
WildEarth Guardians
PO Box 7516
Missoula, MT 59807
arissien@wildearthguardians.org

Mike Garrity
Alliance for the Wild Rockies
P.O. Box 505
Helena, MT 59624
wildrockies@gmail.com