

PATRICK GALLAGHER, Cal. Bar No. 146105
AARON ISHERWOOD, Cal. Bar No. 184392
KRISTIN HENRY, Cal. Bar No. 220908
SIERRA CLUB
85 Second Street, 2nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: (415) 977-5709
Fax: (415) 977-5793

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY and SIERRA CLUB

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
PHOENIX DIVISION

CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY;
SIERRA CLUB,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

MICHAEL WILLIAMS, in his official capacity
as Forest Supervisor of the Kaibab National
Forest;
DALE BOSWORTH, in his official capacity as
Chief of the U.S. Forest Service;
UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE, an
agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture;
ANN VENEMAN, in her official capacity as
Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture;
and UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE.

Defendants.

Case No. CV 04-0355 PCT RCB

**EXPERT DECLARATION OF
DR. JACK STERLING STATES
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT**

1 I, Jack Sterling States, do declare:

2 1. My name is Jack Sterling States. I am a professional biologist with
3 longstanding research interests in the Kaibab squirrel, its feeding habits, and its
4 dependence on the ponderosa pine forests of Arizona.

5 2. I currently serve as an adjunct professor of botany at the University of
6 Wyoming, and as an emeritus professor of biology at Northern Arizona University, where
7 I taught from 1970 to 1996. I earned a Ph.D. in botany from the University of Alberta at
8 Edmonton in 1969 and a Masters of Science in botany from the University of Wyoming
9 in 1966. I have been an active member and officer of Sigma Xi, the scientific research
10 society, and the academic honor society Phi Kappa Phi. My numerous scholarly
11 publications on tassel-eared squirrels include articles and peer-reviewed symposium
12 papers concerning the ecology and dietary habits of the Kaibab squirrel. Attached is my
13 abbreviated resume, including references (highlighted) to the articles I have published on
14 the Kaibab squirrel.

15 3. I have consulted or performed contract research on ecosystem and habitat
16 characteristics in the Grand Canyon/Kaibab National Forest area for the U.S. Forest
17 service, the National Park Service, and the Arizona Game and Fish Department
18 (“AGFD”). I have also contributed to environmental assessments for timber sales in the
19 Kaibab National Forest, and have conducted an in-service training program on ponderosa
20 pine ecology for National Park Service staff at Grand Canyon National Park, and was an
21 instructor for several years in a silvicultural recertification course for Forest Service
22 personnel on topics of forest soil microbiology and Arizona forest ecosystem
23 management.

1 4. Through my research, I have become very familiar with the ecology,
2 population biology and behaviors of the Kaibab squirrel and its relationship with the
3 ponderosa pine forest ecosystem of the Kaibab National Forest in Arizona.

4 5. In my professional capacity, I have been asked by the Plaintiffs in this case
5 to review the East Rim Administrative Record (“record”) as it pertains to the impacts of
6 the East Rim Vegetative Management Project (“Project”) on the Kaibab squirrel. My
7 review has included, among other things, careful examination and analysis of the
8 documents contained in the record that discuss the Kaibab squirrel population and how
9 the Project will affect that population. I have reviewed Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in
10 Support of Motion for Summary Judgment, and I have reviewed Federal Defendants’
11 Memorandum in Support of Federal Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment
12 (Defendants’ Memorandum), with particular attention to the sections pertaining to the
13 Kaibab squirrel. I have also reviewed all of the documents referenced on pages 25 and
14 26, and on page 5, footnote 1, of Defendants’ Memorandum as they pertain to the Kaibab
15 squirrel.

16 6. The statements below reflect my professional judgment based on thirty-five
17 years of biological research, familiarity with relevant scientific literature, and personal
18 acquaintance with the ecology of the Kaibab Plateau.

19 7. I am providing this testimony in order to assist the Court in understanding
20 technical material contained in the administrative record relating to the Kaibab squirrel,
21 and to draw the Court’s attention to gaps and omissions in the Forest Service’s analysis
22 and discussion of Project impacts on the Kaibab squirrel population.

23 8. My testimony here complements my other writing and research, and I
24 provide it in the interest of encouraging the use of valid scientific principles in forest
25

1 planning and management. Because of the public interest nature of this litigation, I am
2 not charging a fee for my services.

3 9. Because of the vulnerability of the Kaibab squirrel population, it is
4 especially important that Defendants consider all relevant factors and properly the apply
5 existing scientific literature in assessing the Project impacts on the squirrel. The Kaibab
6 squirrel has “sensitive species” status (Tab 175 at 4, 11), national natural landmark status
7 (Tab 203), and has been designated by the Kaibab National Forest as a Management
8 Indicator Species (“MIS”). Tab 224 at 2.

9 10. As discussed below, my review of the record leads me to the inescapable
10 conclusion that the Defendants’ analysis and conclusions concerning the effects of the
11 Project on the Kaibab squirrel fail to consider key factors and omit important, relevant
12 information. I also find that Defendants either misconstrue original key aspects of
13 scientific studies in the record relating to the effects of timber harvest on the Kaibab
14 squirrel, such as the Patton study discussed below.

15 11. For more than 10 years, I conducted research, interacted with, and
16 consulted for the Kaibab National Forest (U.S. Forest Service) and Grand Canyon
17 National Park (National Park Service) on issues pertaining to impacts of timber harvest
18 treatments on the Kaibab squirrel. My relationship with the North Kaibab Ranger
19 District was initiated in 1979 when, in collaboration with Dr. Patton and Mr. Richard
20 Wadleigh, North Kaibab district biologist, I assessed squirrel population response to
21 timber harvest by applying a food resource utilization technique to their nine “intensive
22 management” study plots (Patton et al. 1985, Tab 5). In addition, I expanded the study to
23 include sites with “group selection” and “shelterwood” harvest treatments (the same
24 treatments proposed for the East Rim Project). In *no instance* was a beneficial effect
25 (significant increase in squirrel population) noted either then or ten years later at the

1 conclusion of the study. In fact, three of the original Patton study sites (including an
2 untreated control site) had no resident populations of squirrels when re-assessed. I
3 attributed the loss of squirrels to absence of VSS 4-6 age-class trees that had been
4 removed by an unauthorized timber sale.

5 12. The mitigation recommendations for Kaibab squirrel management are
6 included in the EA (Tab 230 at 21) by reference to the ID team wildlife Management
7 recommendations (Tab 173) and are based on Dr. Patton's research. A critical omission
8 in those recommendations is the desirability to manage for pockets of 60% canopy
9 closure or more, and wherein 60% of the trees are 12-17" in diameter and 40% are 18"
10 diameter or greater. Clumps or groups are mentioned but not defined in the design
11 criteria and need to be. The desired condition (suitable and optimum squirrel habitat) of
12 the proposed treatments cannot be achieved if the clump (patch) size, composition
13 (heterogeneity of age classes), density (canopy closure) and distribution (as an arboreal
14 corridor for squirrels) is clearly specified. This is a very serious omission in Defendants'
15 analysis that has the effect of giving the Defendants carte blanche in approving harvest
16 treatments without regard to adverse effects on squirrel populations.

17 13. The record indicates that the Forest Service has the following information
18 regarding the Kaibab squirrel population: (a) population estimates from 1982, (b)
19 population trend data for a limited time period taken from a master thesis, and (c) reports
20 on annual squirrel harvests by hunters. See Vol. 4, Tab 236 at 57-59. Much of this data
21 is extremely outdated or fails to consider key factors (as discussed below). Based on my
22 professional experience, I believe it is entirely feasible for the U.S. Forest Service to
23 collect reliable population data, both actual and trend, for the Kaibab squirrel. It appears
24 Defendants have simply decided not to gather the data.

1 14. Defendants ignored key factors in their analysis of the Kaibab squirrel
2 population data. For example, Defendants refer to what they term a “stable” population
3 trend for combined Kaibab and red squirrels on the Kaibab National Forest from 1988-
4 1999, based on AGFD surveys and a student’s master thesis (Salafsky 2002). Tab 236 at
5 57. The student counts were derived by walking and driving, a methodology that does
6 not take into account important factors such as that squirrel sitings are strongly
7 influenced by the availability of food on the ground (mushrooms and truffles). Ironically,
8 the Kaibab National Forest biologist discounts these general route population surveys by
9 stating, “This information serves the Department’s [AGFD] needs far better than ours.”
10 Tab 133 at 13.

11 15. The record evidence shows that the Kaibab squirrel populations, rather than
12 being stable, are actually in decline. According to one of Defendants’ MIS report (Tab
13 222 at 36), the estimated Kaibab squirrel population declined by 76% over a 20 year-
14 period from an estimate of 22,000 to 5,300 in the year 2002. Tab 222 at 36. (The 2002
15 estimate was based on the trend data discussed above. *Id.*) The population trend table
16 summary (Tab 222 at 24) lists the Kaibab squirrel population status as uncertain, as
17 indicated by the question mark in the table. In addition, the National Natural Landmark
18 status report (Tab 223 at 1) notes a “recent steep decline” in the small endemic
19 population of the Kaibab squirrel. The decline may be due, *in part*, to drought. But
20 because the current drought affects squirrel survival by limiting the food resources
21 provided by ponderosa pine, a timber harvest project of the magnitude planned for the
22 East Rim will quite likely serve to exacerbate the problem – a key factor that Defendants’
23 analysis fails to consider. A final point is that stability estimates by Defendants’ experts,
24 as indicated by averaged population counts, neither reflect nor consider the management
25 actions of the AGFD taken over the years to mitigate and prevent “bust” cycles of Kaibab

1 squirrels from dropping below a threshold of no return, as evidenced by the several-year
2 moratorium on hunting in the 1960's.

3 16. The AGFD population data cited by Defendants was derived through and
4 hunter harvest information game surveys for red and Kaibab squirrels combined. The
5 averages are graphed over 15 years providing a general impression of stability. *See* Tab
6 236 at 58. Averages eliminate extremes and thus fail to show the characteristic “boom”
7 and “bust” of Kaibab squirrel populations. Furthermore, a valid interpretation of
8 population stability is reached only when it is separately compared to the *carrying*
9 *capacity* parameters of the habitat *for each species*, something that Defendants and their
10 experts fail to consider in their analysis of Kaibab squirrels.

11 17. The designation of the Kaibab squirrel as an MIS for early seral stage
12 ponderosa pine stands is entirely inappropriate and quite likely to be unproductive. I
13 wish to emphasize this concern by pointing out to the Court that tassel-eared squirrels
14 have been identified as Management Indicator Species by National Forests throughout
15 their range of occurrence. This is because of their specialized association with *mid- to*
16 *late succession ponderosa pine forest habitat* and for the ability to represent other species
17 with similar habitat requirements. Studies of squirrel foraging and nesting behavior,
18 including my own, show that tassel-eared squirrels are basically unaffected by either
19 presence or absence of “dog-hair” thickets and dense pine regeneration, VSS 1-2. (An
20 analogy to the Defendants’ choice would be the designation of rainbow trout as MIS for
21 stagnant ponds.).

22 18. Defendants consider the best Kaibab squirrel habitat to be an interspersion
23 of habitat types within the forest to provide *arboreal travel routes and food on the*
24 *ground and in the trees*. *See* Tab 236 at 57. However, their description of management
25 treatments results is contradictory to this desired condition: “7,790 acres will be thinned

1 *by removing selected trees while retaining sufficient trees to maintain the old-growth*
2 *character of the stands, (and) will create clumps of trees within larger groups and*
3 *increase the percentage of ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir in the groups.”* Defendants’
4 Memorandum at 4 (emphasis added). First, Kaibab squirrels do not use Douglas-fir and
5 its presence introduces competition from red squirrels. Removal of medium aged and
6 mature trees will not create clumps, but instead will thin them thereby decreasing their
7 percentage representation within the group. Removal will also eliminate requisite
8 interlocking canopy thereby disrupting arboreal travel routes, and will decrease or
9 eliminate food production on the ground (truffles and mushrooms). The prescribed
10 placement of clumps with interlocking canopy towards the center of regeneration
11 treatment areas (Tab 173) precludes the possibility of maintaining continuous arboreal
12 corridors of any kind. Defendants’ analysis fails to consider these important factors.

13 19. I do not dispute the purpose and justification made by the defendants for
14 the removal of VSS age class 1-2 trees and thin VSS 3 trees to reduce ladder fuels and
15 unhealthy competition for nutrients and space. Tab 254 at 2. However, the selected
16 management alternative cites, as a goal, the creation of 79% more open areas with some
17 regeneration by removal and thinning of valuable mid-sized tree groups and patches (5”
18 to 17” diameter). Tab 254 at 3. Much of the East Rim has already been extensively
19 harvested. Even after 20 years, the old clearcuts are still evident, many of which have
20 very poor regeneration. Defendants’ analysis did not consider this factor.

21 20. In my opinion, an EIS would be a reasonable and prudent step in resolving
22 the issues presented here. Failing that, I am deeply concerned that the East Rim Project
23 and other projects based on this Project’s rationale and approach, could, through
24 cumulative effects, irreversibly harm the Kaibab squirrel population on the north Kaibab
25

1 plateau. I believe that if Defendants' biologists had considered the factors discussed
2 herein, they would have reached the same conclusion.

3 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing
4 is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

5
6 Executed on _____, 2004

7
8 By: _____
9 Jack States, PhD
10 2 Canyon Shadows Road
11 Lander, WY 82520
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25