

Chad Stewart
Forest Supervisor
GMUG National Forests
2250 Highway 50
Delta, Colorado 8141

April 20, 2023

Re: Request for a Meeting to Discuss Reconsideration of the Spruce Beetle Epidemic and Aspen Decline Management Response

Dear Mr. Stewart,

On behalf of High Country Conservation Advocates, Sheep Mountain Alliance, and Wilderness Workshop (collectively “conservation groups”), we request reconsideration of the 2016 Spruce Beetle Epidemic and Aspen Decline Management Response (“SBEADMR”) in light of new information related to impacts that may significantly affect the environment, including impacts to Canada lynx and effects of steep slope logging within the SBEADMR priority treatment areas (“PTA”). After reviewing the records provided in response to our November 2022 Freedom of Information Act request, SBEADMR currently violates the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Given these legal vulnerabilities, we request that you immediately pause implementation of SBEADMR until the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forest (GMUG) completes a thorough NEPA review for the steep slope logging decision and reinitiates formal consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for impacts to lynx.

I. Impacts to Lynx

Despite significant impacts from SBEADMR to lynx analysis units (LAUs), and an update to the vegetation polygons for calculating lynx habitat, the GMUG has not reinitiated formal consultation with USFWS nor completed any supplemental NEPA analysis to determine impacts to lynx. This is unlawful.

SBEADMR was originally proposed back in 2013. The project covers a massive area and over a hundred thousand acres of treatments, including in high quality Canada lynx habitat. Because Canada lynx is a threatened species under the ESA, the Forest Service prepared a biological assessment (BA) for SBEADMR in 2016 to determine potential impacts to lynx. The BA concluded the SBEADMR decision was likely to adversely affect the Canada lynx. USFWS agreed in their biological opinion (BO), but concluded the decision would not rise to the level of a ‘take.’ USFWS and the SBEADMR decision relied heavily on the Forest Service’s compliance with the Southern Rockies Lynx Amendment (SRLA), which sets forest standards for projects impacting lynx habitat. Specifically, the BO highlighted that: “the design criteria and adaptive management triggers effectively eliminate the possibility of exceeding 30 percent unsuitable conditions within any of the LAUs[.]” BO at 13.

The GMUG should have reinitiated formal consultation at two required points. First, when monitoring for SBEADMR revealed that adaptive management triggers had been surpassed in the Cathedral and Stewart Creek LAUs. These LAUs were well above the SRLA's 30 percent unsuitable condition threshold. Because the BO was predicated on the LAU's unsuitable condition thresholds staying below 30 percent, this constitutes new information that may affect Canada lynx in a manner or to an extent not previously considered. *See* 50 CFR § 402.16(a)(2) (requiring reinitiation of consultation "[i]f new information reveals effects of the action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not previously considered").

Second, the agency should have reinitiated formal consultation when the GMUG updated its lynx mapping in 2021. The GMUG updated its Canada lynx habitat mapping to keep up to date with spruce beetle mortality modeling in anticipation of the revised forest plan process. As a result of this project, the environmental baseline of lynx habitat on the GMUG changed, with the updated modeling finding that some of the LAUs identified in the Southern Rockies Lynx Amendment exceeded the 30 percent unsuitable habitat condition.

In addition to reinitiating formal consultation with USFWS, the GMUG should have completed a supplemental NEPA analysis when it remapped the lynx LAUs. *See Native Ecosystems Council & Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. United States Forest Service ex rel. Davey*, 866 F. Supp. 2d 1209 (Dist. Idaho 2012) (stating: "like a house of cards built on an unsound foundation, because the 2005 map was not analyzed under NEPA, the agency's analysis under the ESA — which is based upon the validity of the 2005 map— cannot withstand judicial review."). To remedy this issue, the GMUG must pause SBEADMR and proceed with a supplemental NEPA analysis.

II. Steep Slope Logging

Steep slope logging was never considered or authorized when SBEADMR was approved in 2016. In the original SBEADMR decision, the GMUG solely authorized treatments on slopes over 40 degrees by chainsaw. Areas with steep slopes were excluded from analysis under the SBEADMR EIS because of the difficulties associated with steep slope logging. *See* SBEADMR Appendix H1 Response to Comment Report at 142 (stating: "Topographical features will be factored into the placement of group retention and ridges will be avoided. Moderate to steep slopes have already been filtered out based on suitability."). Now, the Forest Service has changed course and authorized steep slope logging on slopes over 40 degrees within the PTAs, which effectively increases the number of treatable acres by 8,500 acres. Instead of preparing a supplemental NEPA analysis, the Forest Service opted for a supplemental information report (SIR), which does not satisfy the agency's obligations under NEPA. The SIR does not satisfy the NEPA's hard look mandate, nor does it satisfy NEPA's public participation requirements.

An agency is required to supplement an existing EIS when "[t]he agency makes substantial changes to the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns" or when "[t]here are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.9(d)(1). The decision to prepare a supplemental NEPA document mirrors the decision to prepare one in the first instance: "[i]f there remains major Federal action to occur, and if the new information is sufficient to show that the remaining action will affect the quality of the human environment in a significant manner or to a

significant extent not already considered, a supplemental EIS must be prepared." *Marsh v. Oregon Nat. Res. Council*, 490 U.S. 360, 374 (1989).

Here, the GMUG's decision to authorize steep slope logging constitutes a substantial change to the proposed action. The agency has now expanded the number of treatable acres to include an additional 8,500 acres that were explicitly excluded from the original decision due to the difficulty of logging these areas. There are major Federal actions remaining that will occur over the remaining lifespan of SBEADMR, including authorized timber sales through at least 2025 with the option to treat units with steep slopes. This type of impact that will affect the quality of the human environment was not considered in the original SBEADMR EIS because the project never contemplated logging on slopes over 40 degrees. Accordingly, the Forest Service must pause SBEADMR and carry forth a process to supplement its NEPA.

III. Conclusion and Meeting Request

The USFS must halt implementation of the remaining SBEADMR timber sales pending reinitiation of consultation with USFWS and reconsideration of existing and foreseeable impacts to lynx. In addition to fulfilling its obligations under the ESA and NEPA, the Forest Service must pause SBEADMR until supplemental analysis is undertaken to support a revised decision to log steep slopes.

Thank you for considering our request, and we would appreciate the opportunity to sit down in person or through a video call to discuss the future of SBEADMR. We look forward to hearing back from your office regarding a meeting no later than Friday, May 5th, 2023.

Sincerely,

Oliver Wood
Conservation Advocate
206-351-5320

Mason Osgood, Executive Director
Sheep Mountain Alliance
Telluride, CO
PO Box 389 84135
970-728-3729

Peter Hart, Attorney
Wilderness Workshop
P.O. Box 1442
Carbondale, CO 81623
970-963-3977

Matt Reed
Public Lands Director
High Country Conservation Advocates
866-349-7104
716 Elk Avenue | P.O. Box 1066
Crested Butte, CO 81224